The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XL — NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1924 — NUMBER 517

Contents

The Week 209

Editorials

- The Progressive Attack on Monopoly 211
- The Gamble of the English Election 213
- Law and Order in the Church 215
- The Use of an Electoral Deadlock 216

General Articles

- Why I Shall Vote For—
  - I. Davis ..... Walter Lippmann 218
  - II. Coolidge ..... Chester Rowell 219
  - III. La Follette ..... Herbert Croly 221
- Dr. Churton and Dr. Deere .... Harvey O'Higgins 225
- The Columnist (sonnet) .... Archibald MacLeish 226
- Tweedledemon and Tweedledumbbell .. Felix Ray 227

Correspondence 228

The Father of Schoolmasters ..... C. E. A. 229

Reviews of Books

- Mark Twain's Autobiography ..... Robert Littell 230
- Modern Mexico ..... James G. McDonald 231
- A Philosophic Critic ..... Lewis Mumford 232
- The Horns of Elfland ..... E. V. 233

The Week

NOW that the campaign is coming to an end, the prophets are almost as busy as the electioneers. They lead an exciting but precarious existence. Never has the result of an election depended upon a larger number of incalculable and shifting factors. There are plausible reasons for believing that in the East, Middle and Far West not more than four citizens out of every ten who voted for Cox in 1920 will vote for Davis in 1924, and less than six out of every ten who voted for Harding will vote for Coolidge. But these percentages are at best a rough average and they vary enormously in different parts of the country. In the South and the border states Davis will run as well as Cox or better. He will receive probably a larger vote in the Electoral College. In the North and Far West, on the other hand, his strength is insignificant. In the East and Middle West he is a much more positive factor in the campaign and may carry a state or two which Cox lost, but on the whole he is in these parts of the country running third. Our impression is that he is gaining rather than losing. Yet if he is gaining, his gains are not sufficient as yet to improve his chances of election. It seems certain that fewer popular votes will be cast for Davis than for either of his rivals.

THERE are two private polls of presidential preferences now being conducted by newspapers and magazines. One of them, conducted by the Literary Digest, has at this writing counted almost two million supposed votes. The other, conducted by the Hearst press, has counted at the time we write less than 700,000. According to both polls Davis is running third; and according to both Coolidge is far ahead of La Follette. But in most other important respects they differ. The Literary Digest's poll assigns about 56 percent of the total vote to Coolidge, 23 percent to La Follette and 20 percent to Davis. If it is correct La Follette will not carry any state except Wisconsin. But it is certainly incorrect and misleading. It seems clear that the lists of voters from which an expression of opinion was solicited were heavily weighted in Coolidge's favor. The poll of the Hearst press assigns at present about 44 percent to Coolidge, something under 36 percent to La Follette and almost 21 percent to Davis. These figures are the most trustworthy that have been collected, but we doubt whether they predict accurately the relative strength of the three candidates as it will actually be exhibited on November 4. It probably over-estimates the Coolidge vote as compared to the votes of his two rivals.

THE underestimate of the percentage of Davis votes is obvious and its reason is plain. Little or no attempt is being made to poll the South except in the case of large cities in one or two states. The percentage of Davis votes in the East, the Middle West and the Far West may not be much more than one-fifth, but for the whole of the country it will be over a quarter and less than a third. The La Follette vote is also probably underestimated for two reasons. It is drawn chiefly from relatively poor and obscure people who are less likely to be discovered by the canvassers and who frequently are afraid to name their preference. How much allowance should be made for underestimates from these sources, it is impossible to say, but it is probable that if the election were held this week the La Follette vote would run over rather than under the thirty-six percent assigned to him at this writing by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poll. Whether he will keep this percentage until the end is doubtful. The Progressive organization is very poorly equipped to marshal its actual and develop its possible vote. If it had been better equipped La Follette would have pushed Coolidge very hard. As it is Coolidge seems to be gaining in the East and Middle West at the expense of La Follette if not of Davis. Whether he will be able at the last moment to nose out a victory still remains doubtful in spite of the betting odds in his favor. At present the chances appear to favor the failure of any candidate to obtain a majority in the Electoral College. But the allegiance of many voters to their present choices is weak, and there may be a considerable shift in their decisions during the last few days.

AN extraordinary situation has developed in Massachusetts over the ratification of the proposed amendment to the federal Constitution giving Congress the power to regulate child labor. In this state, in which there will be an advisory referendum on the amendment in November, the question is of only academic interest as a local issue. Massachusetts already has adopted a satisfactory statewide child labor law of her own. Nevertheless, the forces of reaction are greatly concerned about preventing a favorable verdict at the polls. The action taken in this important state will be closely watched as a precedent by other state legislatures which will vote on this issue during the coming winter. Also, some of the capitalists heavily interested in the textile industry in Massachusetts are likewise owners of mills in the Southern states. They hope that by working now in the North they can prevent the federal action which would debar them from the use of child labor in the South. In their efforts in Massachusetts they have suddenly and surprisingly found an ally in the local chief of the Roman Catholic Church.

WILLIAM, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston, is leading the fight against ratification. A short time ago he wrote to every pastor in the Boston archdiocese urging "that you bring to the attention of your parishoners at all the masses of Sunday, October 5, the danger hidden in the proposed child labor amendment. . . ." He also demanded that two women from each parish should attend a mass meeting against the amendment, which was subsequently held. In most of the churches a condemnation of the proposal written by the Archbishop was read. The Pilot, the official organ of the Boston archdiocese, is also fighting the child labor amendment with considerably more vigor than candor, as will be seen by its statement "that the measure is socialistic in its origin and purport; that it is a veiled attack on family life, that it will transfer the control of all persons under eighteen from the parents to the federal government, that it will establish a great centralized bureaucracy in Washington, and finally that the measure is entirely unnecessary." The Pilot also quotes with approval the resolution of the Georgia legislature which said that the amendment "would give irrevocable support to a rebellion of childhood which menaces our civilization." Perhaps the climax of cruelty and absurdity was reached by the Reverend John P. Gorham, of Woburn, Mass., who in his endeavor to back up the Archbishop declared that the federal amendment is not necessary because "the laws of Massachusetts are sufficient for the protection of all children." The battle is, of course, accompanied by the customary fol-de-rol to the effect that the proposal is "a communistic, bolshevistic plot," and by the professional patriots' usual desperate attempts to identify everyone who takes a prominent part in the struggle for the liberation of the children as a secret agent of Moscow.

WHATEVER may be the interests behind Cardinal O'Connell they have been sufficient to cause Major James A. Curley, Boston's famous and flamboyant mayor, to execute an extraordinary one-day flop on this question. Mayor Curley is the Democratic candidate for Governor of Massachusetts. The state convention of this party, like the national one, endorsed the child labor amendment. On October 6, Mayor Curley declared flatly that he would stand by the amendment. On October 7, he repudiated it with a large quantity of words borrowed bodily from Cardinal O'Connell's propaganda factory, all to the effect that giving power to Congress to prevent the merciless exploitation of children is part of a bolshevist plot to capture the government.

WE hardly need to point out to our readers the evil consequences of thus throwing the weight of authority of a high Roman Catholic prelate into the consideration of what ought to be a non-partisan, non-political question of human welfare. If ever anything deserved to be considered on its merits, it is this business of freeing children from about the last, and in many ways the most terrible, of all the forms of slavery. Yet the action of the Cardinal makes it impossible that this shall be the case. The fires of religious prejudice and passion will now be lighted. For a church to go openly into politics is a dangerous thing at any time and doubly so today when the sort of intolerance represented by the Ku Klux Klan, and not without its counterparts on the other side, is abroad in the land. Cardinal O'Connell may be sincerely animated by the absurd fear he professes that the child labor amendment will abolish the church's parochial schools; but if so, he has certainly done their cause far more harm than good.

THE campaign speeches of Secretary Hughes have been the chief political incident of the week just past. Mr. Hughes is the most important and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perhaps the ablest speaker the Republicans possess; which makes it all the more regrettable that he should shut his eyes and blaze away with the standardized Republican bunk. He repeats the great myth that a deadlock in the Electoral College means Bryan for President; he affects to see the country in dreadful peril because La Follette proposes to submit a constitutional amendment restricting the Supreme Court's power to nullify federal legislation; he makes the usual faces at the League of Nations with cold disregard for his own declaration voiced in 1920 that a vote for Harding was a vote for America's entrance into the League. While the Secretary of State indulges in this sort of thing, President Coolidge's campaigning consists of bits of platitudinous moral philosophy of a general birds-and-flowers character, while he remains silent on the vital things which the country has a right to hear about. Not a word about the Ku Klux Klan; not a word about the proposal to lower the sugar tariff; not a word on the all-important issue of honesty in government and how he proposes, if he does propose, to clean house and keep it clean.

THE spirit and substance of M. Poincaré's views on disarmament and peace are expressed with classical perfection by Anatole France in the speech of John Cock: "I am a pacifist, Monsieur Bergeret. But, thank God, I'm not a pacifist like you. The peace I want is not your peace. You are basely contented with the peace imposed on us today. We, on the other hand, have too lofty a spirit to endure it without impatience. This soft, tranquil peace, with which you are satisfied, offends our proud hearts cruelly. When we come into power, we will make another kind of peace. We will make a terrible peace, with spurs and trumpets, an equestrian peace. We will make a peace savage and implacable, a peace full of menaces and horror, a flame-crested peace worthy of us, a roaring ,thundering peace, flashing with lightning; a peace more horrible than the most horrible war, which will strike icy fear into the universe and destroy the English people by inhibition. There, Monsieur Bergeret, is the sense in which we are pacifists. In two or three months you will see our peace break out; it will set the world in flames."

DAY by day it had become more evident that the late German Reichstag had come to the end of its usefulness. It was practically impossible to pull the discordant parties into a coalition coherent enough to carry on a consistent policy. And no other country ever stood more in need of a consistent policy than Germany does today. No one can say what complications will arise in connection with the application of the Dawes plan, but they are quite sure to be many and grave. And the German government which handles them ought to be solidly supported, both in the Reichstag and in public opinion. The Reichstag which has just been dissolved was elected as a challenge to Poincaré. It accepted the Dawes settlement without any mandate from the people. Its coöperation in the actual administration of the plan was bound to be uncertain. Even if the elections show increased strength for the Nationalists and the Communists, the political situation will be healthier than it has been in recent months.

HERRIOT'S financial plans, like the Snowden budget, are calculated to allay middle class fears. He proposes to gain a considerable increase in revenue from the suppression of tax dodging—a measure nobody will object to, at least in public. There is to be a new tax on exchange operations, on insurance companies and banks, "on increments, buildings and good will." The last items, as reported in the press, are not very definite, but we take it that all he has in mind is a slight extension of the income taxes falling on business. From the suppression of tax dodging he expects to gain a billion and three-quarters francs; from the new taxes, a billion, and a billion in payments from Germany under the Dawes plan. We suspect he exaggerates the probable budgetary receipts, but even if the yield is as great as he anticipates, his budgetary margin will still remain much too narrow for safety. France is not ready yet to tolerate a government which levies taxes sufficiently productive to insure fiscal stability.

The Progressive Attack on Monopoly

WHILE Republican campaign fund collectors are attempting to dig into the pocketbooks of big business by talk of the "Socialist third party" and by statements that La Follette and Wheeler are a second Lenin and Trotsky, W. Z. Foster, the communist candidate, alleges that La Follette is a hopeless reactionary attached to the competitive system of private enterprise, and that he wants nothing more than to break up monopolies and return to the outworn era of small business. How can Socialists, asks Foster, stomach such an alliance with the petit bourgeois? Meanwhile Democratic critics point out the apparently divergent aims of La Follette's followers, contending that such a mélange of economic doctrines is no nourishing food for a permanent new party.

These critics, in so far as they are sincere, are suffering from an old and deep-rooted superstition that economic principles can be adequately expressed in a few simple formulae. Either you belong in the tribe of the satisfied and are soothed when your witch-doctor intones such phrases as "private prop-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erty" and "supply and demand," or you belong in the tribe of the revolutionists and can be placated with nothing less than the mystic incantations of class warfare and universal common ownership. But such demonology has little to do with economic realities. Economic science is not a simple orthodoxy but a complex and difficult effort to understand in detail the economic behavior of men and institutions. Salutary economic action on the part of the state must consist, neither of total abstention—of which, indeed, it is in the very nature of things incapable—nor of sweeping decrees. It must consist of well calculated combinations of specific measures, applied experimentally, and altered with the growth of knowledge and the change of situations. The very fact that those who think in terms of the traditional economic categories can make little of La Follette's program is a tribute to his realism. For years he has been dealing with these problems as they arise in public life. His record in Wisconsin and in the Senate proves that few public men are more keenly aware of the necessity of careful research as the basis of political action, few are more alive to the experimental nature of economic measures, or better understand the technique of applying them to specific situations as the need becomes manifest.

It is not true, of course, that the La Follette platform comprises a final and detailed plan of attack on the abuses of private monopoly. No platform could do that. But neither is it true that the platform is inconsistent, or that it does not point out a number of sound first steps in the project of control of the national economy for the interest of the majority of plain citizens. If his critics had been equipped with a real understanding of economic welfare and a scientific point of view, and if they had examined the La Follette platform and record, they would not be so puzzled about his tendency as they now seem to be.

The basis of all other action, La Follette contends in his acceptance message, is a "return of government to the people" by the creation of a new political instrument in the shape of a party of progressive principles which shall not be financed by those very interests which now benefit from the economic control of the party system and the action of mental nature of the connection between the economic control of the party system and the action of elected officers he is explicit and insistent. This fact alone distinguishes him either in sincerity or intelligence from other candidates who claim to be progressive.

Next to control of the government itself by the farmers, wage-earners and other non-beneficiaries of monopoly, the democratic control of credit is most important. In the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Farm Loan System the government now has two credit agencies of immense potential power. La Follette proposes to inject into the management of these two enterprises the point of view of the farmer, the wage-earner and the consumer. He proposes to appoint to the managing boards properly qualified representatives of these classes, and to prevent exclusive control of the system by those in close sympathy with international financiers. His encouragement of coöperative enterprises of course includes the coöperative labor banks and investment companies, which are building up a popular control of credit from the bottom.

La Follette's policy with regard to the railroads confutes those who contend that he is a dogmatic adherent of competition. He does not wish to restore railroad competition, but rather looks forward to a complete elimination of it by government ownership. If any of the Socialist program is to be adopted, a basic public utility of this sort is certainly the place to begin, and no Socialist administration, if it should achieve power, would attempt more than this as a first step. This solution of the problem, however, is regarded not as immediately desirable, and it is coupled with a promise of safeguards against bureaucratic operation. We shall have to learn the functional rather than the military type of administration, and we shall have to be able to combine it with a practical form of industrial democracy, before public ownership can do full justice either to the public or to the employes. Rapid progress is now being made in both these respects. In the meantime, La Follette concentrates on two immediate measures—the substitution of genuine conciliation and arbitration for the bureaucratic Railroad Labor Board, and the establishment of a valuation for rate-fixing purposes which will eliminate the water in railroad securites. Valuation is a ticklish and uncertain task at best, but it is essential to any public rate-fixing activity, and probably no one has evolved a better formula than La Follette's "prudent investment." The valuations fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission conform to no recognizable principle, but waver about between cost less depreciation, cost of reproduction, and market value of the properties. The result is usually close enough to the book value to include most of the water. If a method can be devised under which financiers can no longer play with railroad securities, and railroads themselves can be operated, not as profit-making enterprises, but as genuine public servants, the chief source of the profits of private monopoly in the United States will be broken.

Almost as basic as railroads is mechanical power. The United States now faces the development of a gigantic extension of electric power, through the exploitation of water power and the linking up of electric power stations in large systems. The effects of this development, not only on industry, but on home life are incalculable. La Follette, alone among the three candidates, stands for public development and public ownership, so far as possible, of this new enterprise. In the absence of such a policy, it is certain that another aggregation of private monoly is inevitable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The La Follette taxation policy is a well considered attack on the abuses of monopoly. Such monopolies as cannot be prevented or are allowed to exist register their activities in immense profits. The Progressives would reclaim part of these profits for public use by excess profits taxes and graduated corporation income taxes. Such taxes cannot possibly increase costs and prices, but they do lower the tax burden on the citizen of small income. If any surplus should arise after liquidation of the government war debt, it could be invested in productive enterprises for the public benefit, rather than being left to the administration of private financiers who are looking only for the greatest possible money return.

The power of big business is expressed not only in relation to consumers, but in relation to employes. Most of the industries characterized by large and powerful concerns do not recognize or deal with labor organizations. The owners have been strengthened in their struggle against labor by such legalized devices as the blacklist and the "yellow dog" contract, and by sweeping injunctions. Attempts to protect trade unions from these unfair weapons by legislation have almost invariably run afoul of the power of the courts to declare laws unconstitutional. The La Follette platform not only favors the legal protection of unions, but a constitutional amendment to curb the veto power of the courts. We shall not arrive at a solution of industrial unrest through the development of recognized and responsible labor organizations, capable of sharing in the administration of industry, until some such reform is effected—unless in the meantime the courts should be educated to a modern attitude towards the problem. If their education is possible, the agitation of this question which the Progressive movement is causing will further it.

In its farmers' plank the Progressive platform favors not only the credit measures above described, and the encouragement of coöperative enterprises, but a reduction of high protective tariffs on industrial products, which favor monopoly and discriminate against the consumer. A reduction of railroad freight rates and an extension of waterways is also recommended so that the western grain growers may compete for European custom on even terms with the Canadians and others who now benefit from lower transportation charges in overseas trade.

Last of all comes the enforcement of existing law against conspiracies to fix prices and restrict production—practices which have grown tremendously with the unfettered development of trade associations fostered by the war.

This program embodies neither a reckless attempt to dissolve modern industrial organization into its primitive components nor a sweeping application of state socialism. Yet it is a program upon which all those who recognize the problem of monopoly may unite. The farmer, the wage-earner, the professional and small business man all stand to gain by it. The economic pragmatist will accept it as a well calculated and enlightening series of experiments, while the evolutionary socialist could not well ask for more as a practical beginning. It is an excellent example of statesmanship—which consists in the working unification of groups which have varying grievances but the same general tendency, and of leaders who have varying theoretical attitudes but the same general aims, by means of a concrete series of measures applied to an existing situation.

The Gamble of the English Election

ELECTION forecasts are always hazardous and any accuracy which they may turn out to have in the case of the English general election will be more fortuitous than is usual. Electoral statistics show queer results and queerer possibilities. Thus in 1910 Labor elected 42 members of the House of Commons. In 1918, with six times the popular vote in the country, only 57 members were elected. Five years later, with less than double the 1918 popular vote, 191 candidates were returned. In 1922 the Conservatives were in a minority of one and a half millions in the country and had a majority of 75 in the House of Commons. In 1923 this majority was wiped out by the change of 300,000 votes in a total poll of fourteen millions. The Conservatives lost 25,000 votes and 88 seats.

The possible vagarious results are almost limitless. It is true, as James Russell Lowell once said, that democracies count heads instead of breaking them, but to count heads and get a fair result is more difficult than it might seem. There is only accidental correlation between the support mustered by programs in the country and the support which these programs can secure from party adherents in the House of Commons. Every school boy believes that democracy means rule by a majority; but he does not know that frequently the majority in the legislature is an artificial creation of minorities and pluralities in the country. The reasons for this are two in number: three-cornered contests, and the small margins responsible for victories or losses.

At the election in November, 1923, there were 252 constituencies with more than two candidates. In all but forty-five of these the winning candidate failed to receive a majority of the vote. Nine constituencies returned two members, so there were in the last House of Commons 216 minority members distributed among the various parties as follows: Conservative, 96; Labor, 70; Liberal, 49, and Independent, 1. After the 1922 election only 179 seats were held on minority support in the constituencies. In the present campaign there will probably be some arrangement between the Conservative and Liberal parties; candidates will be with-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drawn in order to afford better opportunities of defeating Labor candidates in straight two-party fights. It is impossible to estimate the probable success of these tactics. Such figures as are available from the 1923 election are not very illuminating.

In 1923 the Liberals intervened in 47 constituencies. The result was that the Conservative vote of 1922 was reduced by 27½ percent and the Labor vote by 18 percent. Labor contested 16 new seats, and the Tory vote was reduced by 15 percent and the Liberal by 14 percent. The Liberals in 1923 withdrew 25 candidates, with the result that the Conservative vote was increased by 14,297 and the Labor vote by 46,834 in the constituencies affected. The Conservatives also abstained in 15 constituencies and the Liberal vote was increased by 66,953 while Labor gained only 9,546. These figures, so far as they show anything, suggest that in new contests the Liberals take more from the Conservatives than from Labor, and Labor takes more heavily from the Conservatives than from the Liberals. On the other hand, abstentions by the Liberal party mean a gain for Labor, while the retirement of a Conservative means a marked increase for the Liberal candidate.

These general tendencies are of course subject to complete contradiction by local conditions. Any accommodation between the Conservative and Liberal parties to defeat Labor will work out differently in different constituencies. Some candidates will be run because, say, the Conservative believes that he will have a better chance if his opponents are split into two camps. After the election of 1923 there were stories of anonymous contributions for Labor candidates to contest particular constituencies in order to insure the defeat of the Liberal aspirants. Three cornered fights lead to bargainings, uncertainty, and to minority members. Of the triangular contests in 1923 the Liberals won 52; Labor, 84, and the Conservatives 116. In these contests the voter knows that if he supports his own candidate it may result in the election of the one he dislikes most. But the curious fact is that whereas in 1922 the Conservatives got 347 seats in the House of Commons with a total vote of 5,565,000, and in 1923 were reduced to 258 seats with a vote of as many as 5,544,000 (an extremely small change), in 1922 the Conservatives had one less minority member than they had in 1923.

Vagarious results come also when there are no three-cornered fights. At the 1906 elections in England, only 18 percent of the electors changed their votes, but a substantial Unionist majority was suddenly turned into a huge Liberal majority. A simple illustration will show the mechanics of these anomalies. Suppose that in an election of the House of Commons, five constituencies return five Liberals by majorities of 200 apiece on a 10,000 poll:

Smith (Liberal)	5100
Brown (Conservative)	4900

and by the next election 150 voters in each district have changed their minds so that the result in each case is

Brown (Conservative)	5050
Smith (Liberal)	4950

then what 750 voters have done is to defeat five men who represented (or over-represented) the Liberals of the five districts. The advocates of proportional representation go on to argue that the 750 voters have no greater right than to change their own representatives; that the whole five constituencies should be grouped together and should be represented in the first case by three Liberals and two Conservatives; that the change of votes should dismiss only one Liberal instead of five. The only point we desire to make is that with these small margins for victories or defeats, a tiny percentage of the total electorate (in this case it was one and one-half percent: 750 out of 50,000) can determine the success or defeat of a number of candidates.

This is bound to happen in the English election. In November, 1923, more than 60 seats were won by majorities of less than 500. One Liberal was successful by 3 votes, a Conservative by 6, and a Laborite by 26. The change of a few votes here and there will change the representative. Apparently the Conservatives have more to fear than the other parties, for about half of these dangerous seats are held by them. But 500 is an arbitrary number; a change of 1,000 votes would not be unusual in a total poll of say 25,000 for a constituency, and it is evident that small shifts of opinion in the country can play havoc with the results of the election.

In one respect the 1923 House of Commons was rather unusual. The parties were represented very nearly in proportion to the votes they polled in the country. This correspondence was closer than for many years but it was entirely accidental. Contrast, for example, the following results in the 1923 election:

Birmingham:	Votes	Seats
Conservative	149,980	11
Labor	76,114	0
Liberal	28,980	0
Manchester:	**Votes**	**Seats**
Conservative	104,027	1
Labor	79,885	4
Liberal	71,141	3

In the first case, minorities have no representation at all. In the second case, they are over-represented. And considered from another angle, the 1923 election was remarkable. The average number of votes recorded for each seat obtained was nearly the same for all parties. It ranged from 29,348 votes per seat for Liberals to 23,981 per seat for the Labor party. In 1922 the Conservatives got a seat for 18,180 votes, the Labor party a seat for each 30,706 votes, while the Liberals had to number 48,-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

540 to each member of the House. The anomalies of the 1923 election simply corrected each other in an astonishing fashion. But it is possible that they may occur again in unexpected ways and add up to a greater anomaly instead of being cancelled. Hence the difficulty of an election forecast.

Law and Order in the Church

The Assembly could not have gone further in the direction of according you a welcome. At the same time the Assembly could not have done less toward maintaining the order and procedure of the church.

DR. WORK to DR. FOSDICK.

THE action of the Presbyterian General Assembly versus Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick is being discussed very widely as a manifestation of "fundamentalism." This is probably quite incorrect. It is not a case of the shock of contradictory opinion in matters of belief. It is rather that of an established institution and a disturbing personality. Dr. Fosdick holds opinions which have proved offensive, no doubt, to many and important members of the Presbyterian church; but he is being expelled because he is an agitator.

On the surface, the attitude of the Assembly appears to be the very reverse of expulsive. Insistently, almost tenderly, it extends to Dr. Fosdick the right hand of fellowship. During the entire period of his ministry at the First Presbyterian Church of New York he has remained nominally a Baptist, acting in the capacity of associate pastor in a Presbyterian pulpit addressed to a distinctly interdenominational congregation. The vote by which the last General Assembly of the church invited Dr. Fosdick to enter its communion as a regularly ordained minister is not, presumably, a hostile act. Says Dr. Edgar Whitaker Work, writing to Dr. Fosdick as spokesman for the special committee of invitation, "It is our earnest hope that you may see your way clear to accede to the proposal."

Nevertheless, the invitation is compulsory. However much "the General Assembly makes it plain that it seeks the continuance of (Dr. Fosdick's) ministry in the First Church," the ultimatum—join or get out—is no less plain. There is, it seems, a joker. In his reply to the Assembly, addressed through Dr. Work, Dr. Fosdick subjects this disingenuous proposal to ruthless analysis. Accordingly we learn from his letter that the whole point to the request that he assume membership in the Presbyterian denomination lies in the necessity, entailed thereby, of subscribing to the creed. Behind the simple issue of denominational unity lies the more complicated one of theological regularity. Dr. Fosdick is a modernist. He is permanently connected with Union Theological Seminary, accounted by the orthodox a hot-bed of devotional bolshevism. Nominally a Baptist, he is no more acceptable, as John Roach Straton broadly hints, to the regulars of that denomination than to their brothers in the Presbyterian fold. For years, indeed, he has sustained violent and bitter attacks from the fundamentalists of both churches. All this, Dr. Fosdick clearly implies, is involved in the recent action. To affiliate himself with the Presbyterian church as a member in good standing would be to abandon the interdenominationalism of his mission, to subscribe to a rigid formula, the Westminster Confession, to sign on the dotted line. This he cannot do.

Such being the case, the theological motive would seem to predominate. The Judicial Commission of the Assembly has ruled: "If he can accept the doctrinal standards of our church, as contained in the Confession of Faith, there should be no difficulty in receiving him. If he cannot, he ought not to continue to occupy a Presbyterian pulpit." To which Dr. Fosdick has rejoined: "Any subscription made under such circumstances would be generally and, I think, truly interpreted as moral surrender. I am entirely willing that my theology should be questioned: I am entirely unwilling to give any occasion for the questioning of my ethics." Upon this showing it seems to be a pure case of theological orthodoxy, and the fundamentalists win.

But however much fundamentalism may have had to do with bringing the charges and forcing the issue, no trace of it appears in this statement of the case. The fundamentalists are a party militant. Theirs is no quietism content with bringing all hands to a formal agreement within the walls of a structure of convention. As true reactionaries they have been directing an attack upon the established order of things theological and ecclesiastical with the avowed purpose of overthrowing the authority and the practices which now dominate the churches. In each denomination they have conducted a mass attack upon familiar creeds and the constituted officialdom. Far from being content with the status quo, they have advertised their movement as the recovery of lost fundamentals, the revival of forgotten formulas. In each field they have inscribed banners with slogans suitable to the denomination and, wearing their atavistic rituals upon their shields, they have attempted to carry the central position of the church by storm. In each denomination, though partial victories and sectional defeats have been scored in various localities, the general outcome remains obscure with the forces of fundamentalism somewhat weakened by attrition. Generally speaking, the Protestant churches are just about where they were before the onset of the fundamentalists.

This is true of the Presbyterian church. The attack upon Dr. Fosdick is certainly one skirmish in the larger action. So, at least, the world will interpret it. And when the moderator of the General Assembly takes advantage of the occasion to remark that the many expressions of sympathy with Dr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fosdick "may serve to awaken the Presbyterian church to its peril," denial is difficult. Nevertheless, the decision upon Dr. Fosdick was rendered not by a sect but by the church. The requirement imposed was not the resurrection of an ancient faith but a subscription to the usual, conventional formula. Dr. Henry van Dyke has noted pertinently that the fundamentalist requirement would have been not simply the established creed but the "five points of the declaration of 1910" outlining the fundamentalist position. Furthermore, and this is most important, no specific point of theology has been raised between Dr. Fosdick and the church. The Judicial Commission has indicted no heresy; Dr. Fosdick has nailed no theses upon the door of the First Presbyterian Church. What the church requires is regularity. What Dr. Fosdick has resigned for is "the integrity of the individual conscience."

Here is the basic issue, an issue not of reaction but of conservatism. All questions of doctrine are beside the point. The conservative asserts no militant postulate. He is simply content not to think at all. The strength of his position is that he doesn't have to think. He has an established order that exacts only that he hold the lines. He is equally impervious to improvement either toward the right or toward the left. But most important of all, he is on top. There is no standard of measurement but that which is; what is, accordingly, is right and virtuous. The established order represents moderation, judicious compromise of extremes, common sense in government, in short, all that is accepted and accustomed and expected, world without end. Whoever thinks or does otherwise is an agitator.

The pachydermatous invulnerability of true bred conservatism to the onslaught of any form of innovation is actually maddening. Faced by the solid phalanx of conservative Presbyterian respectability Dr. Fosdick can point out that he is an initiator of great influence for good to "Evangelical Christianity," to which the church answers, with a bland smile, that he is cordially invited to step inside. He may retort that he is conscientiously opposed to the closed shop. But the good churchmen who are within can bow gravely to each other in mutual acknowledgment of the complete freedom and comfort which they have always found within the fold of the established church, than which no sensible man could desire more. As Dr. van Dyke has put it, "Dr. Fosdick is free to enter the Presbyterian church in the same terms as we liberals who were born in it and loyally remain in it." There are no issues save the universal conservative formula: personal incompatibility; the lamentable idiosyncracies of the agitator. Dr. Fosdick can defend no theses of his own; none have been attacked. He can attack no article of the accepted creed; none has been put forward as sine qua non. The issue is not what he thinks, but that he, unfortunately, thinks at all. He is, in the eloquent phrase of Dr. Work, the author of "a state of disturbance."

The moral of this story is obvious and anything but tragic. Dr. Fosdick and the Presbyterian church have proved to the satisfaction of all beholders that for them to work in harness is a grotesque futility. Their basic dispositions are antithetical. The church exists to conserve tradition and resist change. Dr. Fosdick, and his equivalents in every walk of life, exist to promote change and resist inertia. The very existence of Dr. Fosdick is a danger to the Presbyterian church. Its most powerful weapon is the illumination of his character as a dangerous agitator. But by the same token the Presbyterian church, and its likeness throughout the social structure, is an obstruction to all that the world hopes to gain from men of genius, and Dr. Fosdick's one advantage lies in making that fact clear. The Established Institution is the end of all hope, the haven of spiritual inertia, the sheltering conservatory of the intellectually supine.

The Use of an Electoral Deadlock

OF late we have been hearing on every hand a new and strange electioneering argument. A vote for La Follette, it is urged, would only work toward a deadlock in the electoral college. Coolidge and Davis supporters alike employ this argument; they agree on the dangers of the deadlock and disagree only on the course of action the voter ought to take. Nor is it only the out and out partisans of Coolidge and Davis who shrink back from the thought of an electoral deadlock. Thousands of independent voters who are inclined to favor La Follette on his merits are unwilling to vote for him if the net result will be that the election of the President must be consigned to Congress.

We can understand why every voter should prefer a straight majority for his favorite candidate to a deadlock that would expose him to further uncertainties. But why should any voter prefer to a deadlock the defeat of the man he regards as most fit? What is there so terrible about the thing itself? It was a grave matter in 1876, when the passions of the Civil War had not wholly subsided. That election affords no analogy to the conditions of today. To find a true analogy we have to go back to the elections of 1824, just one hundred years ago.

The political conditions preceding the elections of 1824 present a striking parallel to the political conditions of the last four years. The two great parties of the formative period of our history, the Federalists and the Republicans, had fulfilled their missions. An "era of good feeling" or more properly of political ambiguity and personal politics had supervened. Accident and personal advantage, rather than principle or conviction determined the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party alignment of political leaders. There was, indeed, a perfectly definite division of interests in the country, between the democratic elements predominant in the West and the autocratic and propertied elements of the northern and middle sea board states. This division of interests found no more satisfactory expression in the politics of the twenties of the last century than the division of interest between our democratic farmer-labor elements and our business classes have found in the politics of the twenties of this century. Anybody could vote for any party, assured that his political interests would be but indifferently represented by a party which had to be all things to all men.

In the elections of 1824 there were four candidates in the field, Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, William H. Crawford and Henry Clay. To press the analogy for all it is worth, Jackson was the La Follette of his time, Clay the John W. Davis, John Quincy Adams the Coolidge. We have no analogue for Crawford, but since he was excluded by disabilities before the choice was finally made, we may ignore him. In the electoral college Jackson received 99 votes, John Quincy Adams 84, Crawford 41, Henry Clay 37. As no one had received a majority the election fell into the House, where Henry Clay threw his influence on the side of John Quincy Adams and elected him. We are not presenting this analogy with prophetic intent. We do not predict that John W. Davis will follow in the footsteps of Henry Clay if the election is thrown into the House, nor would we care to predict the contrary. What we are concerned with here is the political effect of an election made by Congress.

There was in 1824 a period of intense political activity in Congress before the issue was settled. Every political leader was forced to recognize that the time for political ambiguities was past. He had to range himself either with John Quincy Adams, the bureaucrats and conservatives or with Andrew Jackson and the democratic radicals. A real party alignment had become inevitable. Congress, then as now, the product of an earlier election and representative of a political mood that no longer prevailed, gave the presidency to the conservatives. It was a delusive victory. For the democratic elements, now hammered by defeat into a coherent party, elected Jackson by an overwhelming majority in 1828. The Jacksonian democracy had attained to self-consciousness. It evolved definite political principles and reliable leadership. It became a fit instrument for American political life, and remained fit until the slavery issue arose to force new alignments.

If the next election is thrown into Congress the deadlock that will ensue is not likely to be broken soon. Every member of Congress will have to consider his whole political future more seriously than he ever did before in his life. Men who have called themselves Republican while repudiating a majority of the principles of the party will be compelled to hold themselves to a reckoning. Expert generalship will be required, especially of the supporters of La Follette, who will never be forgiven if they fail to make every card in their hands count for all it is worth.

Out of this contest we shall have a President elected either by a coalition of conservative Republican and Democratic votes, or by a coalition of the radicals of both parties with the La Follette group. In either event we are pretty sure to have a thoroughgoing realignment of parties in the next four years. In any case, the man elected President will be the choice of a minority of the American people. His position will be essentially precarious. And this very fact will infuse political energy into both his supporters and his opponents. American politics is certain to be the more realistic in consequence.

We recognize that a prolonged deadlock involves inconveniences of some moment. Business may be adversely affected, especially if its position becomes uncertain, through general economic influences, as it may. Many unlovely political passions will be set loose. But nothing of value is to be had without price. And we think that the clarification of political issues, the realignment of parties in conformity to real political interests, is worth the price.

Most Americans will agree that our governmental machine depends for its efficiency upon the healthy competition of well-organized political parties. They will agree that we do not now possess parties established upon a basis of organic principle. We may put the Republicans into power, and where are we? What single issue have we carried to triumph? If we are discontented with the Republicans and put the Democrats into power instead, what have we accomplished? We have replaced one motley crew by another, and may expect only the ambiguous performance of a motley crew.

The next election may go far toward ending so absurd a situation. If it does, it will be by virtue of the fact that the independent voters are not frightened by the bugaboo of a deadlocked electoral college, but face the prospect calmly as a necessary stage in the progress toward political health.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1924, IN THE U. S., BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 WEST 21ST ST., NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRES., ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.,
DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON R. M. LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS, CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why I Shall Vote For—

I. Davis

I SHALL vote for Mr. Davis because he is the only man who can be elected in place of Mr. Coolidge, and I do not wish directly or indirectly to give the present administration another term of power. I shall vote for Mr. Davis because it seems to me highly important that the next President should be willing to coöperate with Europe in organizing the peace of the world. I shall vote for him because it seems to me important that the next President should be neither bewildered, antipathetic nor obtuse in the face of the present sectional and class divisions. I shall vote for him because I believe that in this post-war world of fierce nationalisms his strong Jeffersonian bias against the concentration and exaggeration of government is more genuinely liberal than much that goes by the name of liberalism.

In short, I think it more important to vote so as to determine the character of the administration in the next four years than to vote for a new party system which may or may not be established in 1928 or in 1932. Perhaps the immediate consequences would not seem so much more real to me if I saw in the La Follette movement the materials and the ideals of a great liberalizing effort.

First, the practical politics of the La Follette movement. Here in the East its supporters, the New Republic among them, are arguing that the new party is to destroy and supplant the Democratic party as the opposition to conservative Republicanism. This seems to me impossible. The Democratic party is more or less indestructible because of the solid South. A party which enters every campaign with roughly half the electoral votes is not in my opinion going to disappear. It seems extremely unlikely that La Follette will break the solid South, and almost as unlikely that the Southern Democrats will coalesce, as the New Republic has suggested, with the Eastern Republicans. If the Democratic party survives, and if the Republican party survives, there is not under the presidential system of government any permanent future for a third party. I believe the La Follette movement is almost certain to be re-absorbed into the two old parties. It might dominate one of them for a time, as Bryan dominated the Democratic party with one interval from 1896 to 1912. But in the sense that it will make a new party system, intellectually distinct, emotionally honest, logical, clear cut and free of cant, I do not believe in the promises made in its name.

I think the exponents of the new party have never really understood the federal character of the American party system, have never understood that we have in fact no national parties, but only national coalitions of state parties, and that as long as the President is not directly elected by a plurality of voters, the vitality of the party will remain in the state organizations. These state parties are independent bodies which come together every four years, as La Follette's Wisconsin and Lodge's Massachusetts used to come together. The national conventions set out to unite the state organizations on the basis of formulae which won't seriously divide them, and under the leadership of candidates who are popular in the dominant groups of states and acceptable to the others.

I shall not undertake here to argue whether this system is as absurd as it sounds, except to note in passing that it is the only political system we know under which a continental state has combined a strong central government with wide home rule. The British system of government is no analogy whatsoever, and even if it were, its comparative failure to deal successfully with Ireland and Ulster should be set beside the American success with half a dozen potential Irelands and Ulsters. In fact, I believe that the discerning historian will recognize more clearly than we can or perhaps need to do, that the success of federalism in America has depended largely upon the sectional accommodations achieved through our flexible and unprincipled two-party system.

But whether or not the fundamental virtues of that system outweigh its obvious stupidities, its frequent venality and its intellectual sterility, it is so deeply imbedded in our social system that it will, I think, upset the plans of Mr. La Follette's supporters. I should feel less certain of this if it were not already apparent that the La Follette movement is yielding to the same conditions. It too is a coalition of local organizations, and this early in its career, it exhibits all the symptoms of that same equivocation which the unifying of diverse elements requires. On foreign policy, on the question of whether to break up monopoly or socialize it, on immigration, on prohibition, even on the Supreme Court, the La Follette movement speaks with an uncertain voice or none at all. Why is that so? The New Republic, as I understand it, has argued that the La Follette movement was a gathering of the disfranchised and dissatisfied, and that when they were gathered they would unite on a coherent platform. I am skeptical about this explanation. For I think Mr. La Follette was shrewd enough to know that his hope of uniting his followers lay in avoiding the issues that divide them. He acted as every political leader does and for the same reasons and under the same compulsions. And when I see the New Republic making a virtue of Progressive ambiguities while it expends its scorn on Democratic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Republican ambiguities, I smell the old familiar business of rationalizing your partisanship.

I am prepared to admit, of course, that I am misreading the political situation and that in some way a significant and profound realignment of parties will result. But this possibility seems to me too remote and doubtful to overcome the feeling that it is very important not to give this administration four more years of power. I might vote for La Follette, nevertheless, if I felt that he was the exponent of a genuine liberal and progressive movement. For it might be worth while to ignore the character of the next administration for the sake of the educative effect of the La Follette movement.

But in many ways, and even though I warmly respect Mr. La Follette, I do not like the main drift of his preaching. His political program is almost violently nationalistic and centralizing; that seems to me reactionary and illiberal. His policy in respect to large corporations seems to me an illogical mixture of the individualism of 1890, as expressed in the Sherman Act, and pre-war Socialism. His foreign policy seems to date about 1919, and to ignore all that has happened in Europe since the Treaty of Versailles was first published. The net effect of what he has to say about Europe is to combine American irresponsibility and isolation with provocative statements about the policies of France and England.

I feel that if I am to cast my vote for a candidate who cannot be elected, and by that vote to help elect the man I think ought not to be elected, then at least I ought to be able to vote for a man who is bravely and lucidly expounding what seems to me a liberal program. Mr. La Follette does not offer me that compensation. I shall therefore vote for Mr. Davis because in foreign policy and in his attitude toward the sphere of government he seems to me to be on the right track, more nearly on the right track than either of the two other candidates. I shall vote for him, not only believing that he is headed in the right direction, but that in personal character and in experience of the post-war world he is the best equipped man. And if the movement for a new party system has the vitality claimed for it, it will, I think, be helped rather than obstructed by the presence in the White House of a man able to understand it, and resourceful enough to put it on its mettle.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

II. Coolidge

AS a Progressive—of that perhaps obsolescent sort that still believes in democracy—I have decided to support Coolidge. Not, of course, that I agree with him in everything, or that I accept unreservedly the Republicanism of the moment; but because, on the realities of the case, this seems to me the most practical way now available to make one citizen's vote and influence effective for democracy.

Recent inquiry develops that nearly all those who were most conspicuous in the Roosevelt movement of 1912 are now for Coolidge and that in their opinion this is also the position of the main body of the Progressive voters of that time. Of the few who are not for Coolidge, as many are for Davis as for La Follette. Whether this means that these people are not now Progressives, or that the newest La Follettism which seeks to appropriate the name is something else than Progressive, may be left to those who enjoy quibbling over definitions. At any rate, this, the largest concrete group that ever called itself "Progressive" does not concede the title to La Follette, and anyone who goes with them to Coolidge will not find himself lost in reactionary company. I can of course only speak for myself, but I am confident that the views I am here expressing are fairly typical of those of millions of others of this group who have reached the same conclusion.

"A condition, not a theory, confronts us." What this campaign will determine practically is not which candidate is elected, but whether there is an election. Davis cannot be elected. Coolidge cannot be elected by a scratch. He must have a substantial margin over Davis or he will have none over all. La Follette is not even running to be elected. He is running to prevent election. Either Coolidge will be elected by the people or we shall have a President not elected by the people. That might be no objection if, like most extreme radicals and reactionaries, one did not believe in democracy. But it happens I do. I cling even to its forms, because without them I fear for the substance. The mere mechanism of popular government—even if, this year, it seemed nothing more—is a tool tremendously worth holding intact for continued use. Those who are now trying to break it down would not think it worth their while unless they hoped also to block it next time, and more times. If that must happen I am willing, after it is done, to help build something hopeful on the wreckage. I am not willing to be a party to the wrecking.

Neither can I be indifferent to the practical outcome. I do not want Charles W. Bryan to be President. Of the six candidates for President and Vice-President, he is the only one who falls preposterously short of what we have come to consider the presidential measure. Did you ever read the "Commoner" while he was running it, with "W. J." as absentee contributor? If not, spare yourself the shock! He is touted as the one "Progressive" in the major party field. Emotionally, he doubtless is progressive. But if mere "one hundred percent for the people" sentiment were all,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Andy Gump would be the ideal candidate. Governor Bryan's Nebraska policies have been both propressive and reactionary, with no indication that he knew which was which. Administratively he is a putterer, who would be lost in a great executive place. We may accept constructive conservatism as one of the periodic phases in the rhythm of democracy—but not that caliber of futile pseudo-progressivism.

Or, if we look beyond this election to the future, the case is even stronger. The personal candidacy of Senator La Follette cannot in the course of nature be repeated. Unless something capable of impersonal survival can come of it, his movement ends in a mere negative protest this year. That something could only be a third party avowedly founded on class. Now, I may be archaic, palaeocrystic, obsolete, Byzantine, mid-Victorian, and all the other back-number epithets in the thesaurus, but I am not ready to accept class as the basis of political division in America. In this, I am nearly as Silurian as President Lowell. If the economic determinists are correct, it is coming anyway—but not with my help! I concede the many absurdities in the established parties. Some of us tried twelve years ago to make them contemporaneous and failed. Now the advanced intelligentsia think that we, too, have ceased to be contemporaneous. But until something better can be had—and a group system of class parties would be something much worse—even these "atavistic" parties do serve a useful purpose. They may have been bulldozed at times by class blocs—business, farm, soldier and labor—but they are not class parties. By their appeal for support from all classes and sections they are a potent factor of national unity. And they are mechanically capable of operating our national electoral apparatus—something physically impossible under the class bloc system. For these services, in the hope that they may grow also to better ones, much may be forgiven them.

Whatever may be the alignment of the future, the Republican party will be either one of the major parties or the parent of one. Leaving it for the future to determine whether, when it thus finds its place, I shall go with it or against it, I think I am of more present use in helping to hold it intact than I would be in joining with those who, in disintergating it, would disrupt the whole party system.

If we are headed toward class group parties, it is not toward one or three, but many. The mere fact that Senator La Follette did not dare form a party this time, but merely invited the personal support of discordant groups who agreed in nothing else, illustrates the centrifugal tendency. As soon as you get more than two significant parties, you either go back to two or you get more than three. Whatever may happen in England, no class party in America is going to reduce the rest of the people to another class party, and so make a two party system out of that. It will either fizzle, or tend to a multi-party system. I prefer to help it fizzle. I have seen too much of the undemocratic operation of the multi-party system in Europe to be willing to do anything to help introduce it in America. It does work somehow in Europe, even if badly. Here, it would not work at all. We could not even elect a President, organize Congress, or legislate under it, except by making over our whole structure of government. If we ever do that, it should be constructively, to make government more efficient and not merely defensively, to keep it from being stopped.

A platform may not be much reason for supporting a party, but it sometimes contains reasons for opposing it. I am therefore not so much impressed with the things in the La Follette platform and in his historic personal policies with which I agree, as I am repelled by those which I now find dangerous.

La Follette's whole isolationist position, internationally, I find reactionary to the last degree. In all European Parliaments, the Nationalist Isolationists sit on the extremest Right, with Ludendorff or Léon Daudet. I think that is where they belong here. The one exception which he has dragged into his platform is done for pure demagogy, to catch the hyphenate German vote. If what La Follette were really interested in were the legitimate revision of the Treaty of Versailles, he would not have proposed the only method of attack which would guarantee failure.

And of course I do not agree with his scheme to abolish the Constitution, by making Congress the final judge of the constitutionality of its own acts. Minorities—particularly the very class, racial and religious minorities which La Follette is now trying to lump together—are precisely the last Americans who should be willing to surrender the constitutional safeguards. The remedy for the faults of our courts does not lie in that direction. If we must make over our government, let us begin with Congress where it works worst, and not with the courts, which, with all their faults, have protected democracy oftener than privilege. A study, not of adversely selected cases, but of cases generally, will demonstrate this emphatically as to the federal courts. There are better remedies than this, for the cases where this is not true. The proposal to make federal courts elective for short terms is not progressive, but reactionary.

With these reasons for not supporting La Follette, with his assumption of first right to progressive support, the question lies between Davis and Coolidge. I admire Davis personally very much, and I agree with some of his policies even better than with Coolidge's. Any objection that he is a "conservative" might also lie against Coolidge. If it were a mere choice of individuals, I should not worry. Progressives might have to do some impatient marking time under either of them, but the country would be safe, and its course, even if cautious, would be forward.

But in the first place we can not get Davis. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the states which will decide the election, a vote for Davis, like a vote for La Follette, is a vote for no election. And in the second place, for reasons too long to analyze here, I see no constructive prospect in the hodge-podge which is now the Democratic party. If it or some other party is needed as the opposition, I do not care whether it is it or some other. I have no interest in contributing to its evolution or devolution. I do feel that interest in the Republican party.

And I share the national confidence in Calvin Coolidge. Deride the "Coolidge myth" all you like, such traditions do not grow out of nothing. President Coolidge has been under test. To have come through the greatest storm of scandal that has stirred our generation, not merely personally untouched, but with his vessel unwrecked, is a test of results that is not vitiated by any temperamental criticism that he should have been more emotionally dramatic about it. I long ago learned that each person must do things his own way. If it is a good way, and does the work, it is nothing against it that it is not my way. He has shown courage, judgment, intelligence and leadership, in his relations with the people. I am willing to hope that he will be better-armed next time in his relations with Congress. And—one count on the progressive side—I have confidence in his personal independence of reactionary influence. The "Old Guard" may be for him, but he is not for them.

If I were making a candidate and a party to order, I would doubtless propose some amendments to President Coolidge, and many more to the present régime of the Republican party. But upon the whole concrete situation, at a time when the menace to democracy is even more immediate from destructive radicalism and disruptive multi-partyism than from capitalized privilege, and seeing in President Coolidge a force that is at least constructive, and is as near progressive as is now available if we also demand balance and intelligence, I have no hesitation in making my choice.

And I believe that this expresses a view typical of at least a very large part of that group who were once called "Progressives" and who still believe that there is vitality in the Lincoln and Roosevelt ideal of unclassified Americanism.

CHESTER H. ROWELL.

III. La Follette

THE welfare of the American people demands in my opinion the accomplishment by peaceful agitation under the forms of law of certain radical changes in the structure and functions of their national economy and government. The processes whereby wealth is produced, distributed and protected tend in many respects to breed extravagant, shiftless, torpid, intolerant, unenlightened, self-satisfied and undeveloped American citizens. Yet these processes are deeply rooted in the social and economic soil. They are so deeply rooted that ardent, impatient and turbulent spirits have despaired of uprooting them save by some act of destructive violence comparable to the French or the Russian Revolutions. But there is an alternative way which is more suitable, more exhilarating and more congenial to humane ideals. It is, of course, the way of educating a majority of the people to understand the need of radical reconstruction, to discriminate those reforms which are desirable and possible from those which are not, and to participate themselves in the work of renewal. I shall vote for Senator La Follette because in my opinion his election will contribute more substantially than that of his competitors to the needed social and political education of the American people.

Cherishing as I do the vision of a moral and social order which will interpose fewer obstacles between human beings and their fulfillment, I obviously cannot vote for President Coolidge. He is the spokesman of those classes which are satisfied with the effect of the existing system upon the moral quality of the average American. His advocacy is sincere and whole-hearted. The human race will be fortunate, indeed, if its presumably more enlightened leaders of the future can evolve or devise economic or social institutions which will work as satisfactorily as in Mr. Coolidge's opinion our present institutions work. Or to put it in franker language the President's complacency about the America of today is almost incredible in its fatuous ignorance and in its essential absurdity. Historians will smile when they turn over the records and discover that in the first quarter of the 20th century people who called themselves progressives proclaimed reasons ostensibly associated with progressivism for keeping in the presidential chair a man who believed that the America of that day was by way of being Utopian in its successful realization of the loftiest ideals.

President Coolidge's self-righteous complacency is only the reflection of the moral outlook of his prosperous and successful fellow countrymen. The immediate weakness of American capitalism does not consist so much in its abuses. These abuses are not as yet intolerable and against them its defenders can offset considerable and indispensable services. It consists in the tendency of its beneficiaries deliberately to cultivate a state of mind which, if it continues to prevail, will make it extremely difficult if not impossible, to remedy these abuses in an orderly and thorough manner. The Republicans insist upon lumping together the whole existing economic system with its successful and unsuccessful, admirable and mischievous practices and fabrics into one indivisible whole and to condemn all people who wish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

radically to modify it as the enemies, and usually as malicious enemies, of American popular welfare. American business men and their professional spokesmen combine blindness to abuses with resistance to reform and reprobation of reformers. They are tender to the Lorimers, Newberries, Daughertys and Sinclairs. They are fierce against the La Follettes. It is this attitude, suggestive as it is of a too close association between profits and abuses, which has produced the equally aggressive conscious resistance of the La Follette radicalism. Responsible business men have become intensely class-conscious themselves, and they have, consequently, created and justified the existence of an opposing class-consciousness among the people who suffer from their selfishness and obscurantism.

The Republicans of the Dawes type who dominate organized business in the United States will, if they have their way, ruin by their violence and their pigheadedness precious but fallible institutions. They will resist as socially subversive the inevitable attempt to disentangle the ill-adjusted functions in the national economy from those which are working comparatively well, and they will, consequently, do their best to involve the latter in the radical revision which must eventually overtake the former. It is, of course, of vital importance that they should not succeed. The possibility of modifying in an orderly and edifying way those institutions and practices which are most inimical to the better fulfillment of human life in America depends primarily on the willingness and the ability of our business and political rulers to discriminate between those institutions and industries which are functioning well and those which are functioning ill. If the present rulers are neither willing nor able to undertake the job, other more flexible and capable rulers with a different economic and social outlook will have to be substituted for them. The period of transition will be anxious and chaotic, but the responsibility for this uncertainty belongs to those who profit from the failures and weaknesses of the existing national economy and enshrine their profits in the ark of the Constitution.

II

Davis and La Follette are agreed in repudiating the colossal complacency of Coolidge and the stupid violence of men like Dawes. They are agreed in proclaiming that an economic and political system does and should survive by virtue of some measure of flexibility rather than by structural rigidity and functional blindness. But their differences are more considerable and more significant than their agreements. The changes which Mr. Davis would immediately prepare to bring about are few and superficial. They do not touch the existing distribution of political and economic power. For Mr. Davis a progressive program is a group of reforms which the Democratic party, whose active and responsible leaders are the conservative lawyers, business men and professional politicians of their own neighborhoods, is fully capable of realizing. La Follette's program, on the other hand, is the reflection and expression of the salient interests of the members of those classes which the existing system deprives of a sufficient opportunity for liberating activity. Such a program involves necessarily the participation of these comparatively disfranchised classes in carrying it out, and, consequently, in the creation of new agencies of political and economic power for whose operation they will become at least partly responsible.

The Democratic apologists are as definitely, if not as violently, opposed to this demand for independent political power on the part of farmer-labor groups as are the Republicans. They ask the wage-earner or the farmer to trust his economic welfare to a party organization and leaders belonging to a class whose members derive their living chiefly from salaries, interest, rent and profits and whose ideas reflect their activities. They denounce the attempt to build up a political party composed primarily of the classes who live by work as an attack upon the moral unity of American national life. But if the moral unity of the American nation is endangered, the threat comes from those people, who, under the cover of vested interests, partly obsolete institutions and popular inertia are appropriating too large a share of the power and rewards of American life, and who refuse either to share the power or to criticize its exercise. The insurgents discern and propose to thwart the existing tendency to convert the American Commonwealth into a complacent industrialized plutocracy. They do not trust either of the major parties to perform the job because the leaders of both belong to the classes whose conduct, outlook and personal welfare are determined by profitable abuses. No matter how well-intentioned they be, they are bound, as Mr. Davis does, to identify progressivism with a little mild squeamishness about such matters as child labor and the denial to organized labor of the right of collective bargaining. Progressivism of this kind is not intended and will not help to prepare the way for an improved distribution of economic and political power. Its tendency and purpose are to prevent such a new distribution from taking place.

III

The class which has profited from the rapid industrial expansion of this country will never yield its anti-social privileges or modify its mechanism of superiority except as the result of sharp, persistent and implacable pressure. There is no political force in the community which can or will exert the needed pressure except the several large economic groups, which at present are not allowed to count as much as their services and responsibilities entitle them to count in the organization and conduct of American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government and industry. The only way in which these groups can acquire the edge and the energy to challenge the domination of their economic and political superiors is to cultivate an aggressive consciousness of their group activities and interests—to become much more keenly and resolutely aware than they now are of their inferior status and the desirability of obtaining promotion by their own political and economic efforts. Increased awareness of their existing status is the preliminary stage of a necessary educational preparation for the better future exercise of more responsibility and power.

So far, then, from deploring or fearing the organization of a farmer-labor party, I believe it to be the fitting instrument of the orderly but sufficiently thorough-going readjustment of American political and economic life. My chief misgiving about my vote and other votes for La Follette is that they may not avail to bring such a party into existence. That it will come eventually I fully believe, but, as art is long and time is short, it needs to come soon. Many of Senator La Follette's present supporters do not realize how indispensable the conscious political and other self-assertion of economic groups is to the education of the American people and the exercise of improved control over their lives. The larger part of the support which the Senator will obtain at the coming election will be composed in part of conscious or semi-conscious workers, but he will obtain millions of votes which will express merely a mechanical protest against Democracy and Republicanism or some form of hyphenated discontent. American progressivism in its political expression is still far from being a coherent, articulate and self-conscious demonstration. Although it may soon win the support of a sufficient fraction of the American people to elect a president, it is only beginning to educate a personnel which in the event of victory could serve as the adequate human instrument of its purposes.

Hence I cannot attach as much importance as do some of his other supporters to the excellence of Mr. La Follette's achievements in Wisconsin as the chief reason for preferring him. That record surely proves him to be a capable legislator and administrator, but these evidences of his competence in the past do not, I think, shed much light on his ability to accomplish the task of radical reconstruction to which the Progressives are pledged in national politics. The old Wisconsin program is allied to the present program of the Progressives, but it was a program of middle-class legislative reform, such as one of the existing parties could conceivably frame and carry out; and it did not need to enlist to the same extent, as does the more radical program of today, the understanding and the participation of the members of those classes which it is supposed to benefit. The re-organization of American railroads, finance, industry and agriculture in the interest of improved production, diminished waste and of increased participation in the control and conduct of economic processes by the workers is a very different matter from the task which Mr. La Follette faced in Wisconsin. I know of no specific program which looks adequate for accomplishing the desired results. I know of no trustworthy social experience and formulated knowledge out of which the leaders of a progressive party could devise such a program. I know of no class of workers who are sufficiently trained in the exercise of political and economic power to operate the improved mechanism, if it could be devised. A progressive agitation which assumes that these instruments already exist and are available for use in the event of success at the polls is suffering from a serious and perhaps a dangerous delusion.

Yet if this ignorance and incompetence provided a sound reason for refusing to support La Follette, there would be no hope for future reconstruction. The knowledge which is necessary for the framing of an adequate program, and the improved popular education which is necessary to carry it out, can be obtained only by experimental essays undertaken with the help of the existing available stock of knowledge and method. A progressive bloc composed of the members of those classes which need and consciously seek more active and responsible participation in government and economic production is the only agency which will have the courage and the insight to make sufficiently thorough-going and significant experiments. These experiments cannot in the beginning be protected against miscarriage. The knowledge does not exist which would justify experts who might also be progressive in recommending a program which could be guaranteed as relevant and adequate. Thorough-going progressives must be ready to act on the supposition that human beings are capable of an amount and a quality of liberation for which the society of today neither affords the opportunity nor supplies trustworthy instruments. If no sufficient number of people will act as if the vision of increasing human liberation in this world were true, the human mind will never find out how true it may be.

IV.

There are some highly intelligent people who sympathize with a progressive outlook on the social problem, but have scruples about trying the experiment here and now. The formation of a progressive farmer-labor party is alleged to be premature. It lacks, they say, the provocation of a specific issue such as the Republican party created by its determination to keep the institution of Negro slavery out of the national domain. Now it is perfectly true that the Progressive party at present cannot flourish an issue as definite as that which the Republicans raised when they proposed to prevent the admission into the Union of additional slave states, but the only reason why it lacks a sharp definition of its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose is that the American working groups are not as yet sufficiently conscious of their present inferiority of status. The American nation has reached a stage in the understanding of its economic and social problems analogous to that which it had reached in the understanding of the slavery problem at about the time the free-soil party first emerged. Influential public opinion is still doubtful whether the economic conflict raises a question so fundamental that it cannot be settled by drawing Mason and Dixon lines (say at collective bargaining) and declaring that so far but no farther shalt thou go. It does not sufficiently realize that the ownership of property brings with it a power over human life which in existing circumstances is certain to be abused and which, like Negro slavery, tends morally to impoverish both the beneficiaries and the victims of the institution.

By invoking the analogy of the anti-slavery agitation I shall doubtless be accused of proclaiming the existence of an irreconcilable conflict and predicting an ultimate appeal to a forcible settlement. I have done neither. Whether or not the controversy becomes irreconcilable will depend, not upon the exigencies of the conflict, but upon the spirit in which our existing leadership meets the challenge. The possessing groups can make it irreconcilable by treating the insurgency of the working groups as a revolt against a divinely ordained political and economic order which is supposed to be essentially perfect. Or they can make the conflict adjustable by exhibiting some ability to watch and criticize their own group behavior and the operation of their institutions, and to share with the insurgent groups their existing power. In either event the initiative is theirs. They now occupy the citadel of power. They can hold on until it and they are destroyed, or they can allow the artizans of a more humane civilization to enter and punch holes in its grim walls, let in the light and the air and transform it into the habitation of a freer people. At present it looks as if the militant Republicans would follow the bad example of the slave-holding autocracy, and insist upon treating the insurgents as baleful revolutionists whom they are justified in opposing to the bitter end, and, if necessary, defeating by force. But I doubt whether they will continue to talk as boisterously and as irreconcilably and act as stupidly as they now do. The attempt to perpetuate their own privileges by associating them indissolubly with a supposedly absolute body of economic and social truth will, if continued, transform them into fools or fanatics. At bottom they possess, I think, too much common sense and decency not to recognize the danger of the alternative and escape from it.

But no matter how they behave, the conflict itself is one which they will not exorcise or in the long run alleviate by compromises or evasion. Those who wish like Mr. Davis to compromise or evade it are placing themselves in a position analogous to that of the Douglass Democrats or the Constitutional Unionists during the closing years of the anti-slavery agitation. Because slavery was constitutional they shrank from admitting its incompatibility with the ideals of progressive democracy, and they invented many expedients to keep slavery alive and legal without rending the Union. Some of these expedients gained time when time was needed, but they were proposed and recommended as permanent settlments and that they never could be. They perpetuated the institution which the conscience of the American people demanded should be outlawed, and in the end they exacerbated the conflict which they were supposed to heal. Compromises of the same kind will have the same ultimate effect on the equally fundamental controversy of today. In so far as they will not share the power over human life which the titles to certain classes of property bestows upon their possessors with the victims of that power, they evade the problem, perpetuate existing privileges and abuses, and strengthen the obstacles which prevent reconciliation of the conflict.

The advocates of these compromises and evasions like to consider their middle-of-the-road philosophy and practices liberal as contrasted with the alleged illiberalism of the extreme conservatives or radicals. They consider themselves the official spokesmen of a combination between popular good will and expert knowledge which functions by ignoring and reprobating class divisions and by creating a party, such as the English Liberals or the American Democrats, which is supposed to embody and realize this desirable coalition. They have not in my opinion the right to appropriate for themselves or their party the word liberal and any credit which may attach to it. Liberalism seeks to regenerate human life by mobilizing increasingly trustworthy knowledge of man and his worldly environment. Parties, on the other hand, are instruments for exercising political power. They are composed of groups of citizens whose activities and ideas supply them with a sufficient motice for coöperating. No party can claim to be peculiarly liberal on the pretext that the behavior of its members is determined by general good will and expert knowledge. Political divisions and classifications reflect the activities, the conflicts, the alliances and the rise or fall of social groups. They necessarily involve partisanship. One party may represent a progressive social movement and another resistance to it. But no party can represent liberalism in the sense of the application to politics of knowledge and good will as opposed, say, to dogma and group egotisms. Liberalism in that sense is an affair of the spirit and resides, if anywhere, in the individual human soul. Conservatives may possess it in some measure, and so may progressives and socialists. It comes to them as a consequence of their consciousness of the meanings and values of contemporary political, social and moral processes and of the disinterestedness of their allegiance to what they take to be the better values.

HERBERT CROLY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Churton and Dr. Deere

DR. CHURTON is worried. He feels that he has a right to be worried. He feels that his worry is meet, just and available to salvation. He is not worried about himself. He is worried about the world.

And he feels that when *he* is worried, the time has come for the world to take thought—because he is liberal; he is not narrow; he has an unorthodox, free mind and a scientific spirit. True, he has always gone to church on Sundays and lived a conventional life, but he has attended church as a politician kisses babies or joins fraternal orders; and, for the same reason, he has lived as a carefully moral and respectable man. He feels that his judgment has not been warped, however, by this association with conventionalities. No, he has always been superior to conventionalities. He has tolerated them with the easy benevolence of self-interest. If he regards them and their threatened future with anxiety now it is because he foresees disaster for the civilized world and all its works if it abandons that code of morals and system of ethics to which it has tried to conform "for the past 1900 years," as he says.

And here is a group of writers—misled by a group of scientists—attacking that conventional code and dangerously undermining that established system, in the name of what they call vaingloriously "the new psychology." They are also attacking conventional medicine; but Dr. Churton does not worry about medicine. Not at all. Never. Perish the thought. He is not worried for himself or his profession. There is no self-interest in his solicitude. He only fears that the laity may be led astray.

Dr. Deere, on the other hand, is quite a different case. He is one of the dangerous group of scientists who are leading astray the endangered group of writers whose "new psychology" imperils Dr. Churton's world. When Dr. Deere reads the novels that so worry Dr. Churton, he cries: "Good! Good! Now we're beginning to get somewhere." And when he reads Dr. Churton's criticisms of those novels, he smiles.

"Dr. Churton," he says, "had an ancestor who raised his eyes from the ground. Away back in the dim prehistoric beginnings of the first chapter of Wells's Outline of History, an ancestor of Dr. Churton somehow made that amazing advance toward civilization. Up to that time, like his brute brothers, he had conformed to a code of conduct that was, as you might say, wholly animal and automatic. In answer to the itch of mere protoplasmic irritability, he had moved compulsively in pursuit of whatever earthly objects stimulated his senses. In a sort of blind servitude to the objects themselves, he had been dragged here and driven there by the attraction or repulsion of anything that aroused his instinctive responses. And he had been aware of himself only in so far as he was aware of the goodness or badness of the things that made him feel good or bad.

"But now, by some miracle, this first of all the philosophers raised his eyes from the ground—and from those sensory stimuli which had held him to the orderly compulsions of instinct—and became aware of himself. He became aware, at least, of the protoplasmic irritability that was in him. He found himself able to detach himself from the thing that was moving him and to consider his servitude to it, so to speak. He could apprehend that this thing had a power over him, and yet he could refrain from obeying it. Unlike the animals, he could feel his temptation, endure it a moment without acting on it, and perhaps say 'no' to it at last.

"He was a truly great man. He discovered what his descendants, down to Dr. Churton's time, were to call 'mind' and what the new psychology now calls 'conscious mind.' And this discovery was a miracle of progress. It meant that Dr. Churton's ancestor, unlike his blood brothers, could imagine an act instead of blindly acting it. He could dream the action, and get a feeling of the result of it, instead of plunging into the issue of the action blindly. And out of the dream of his action, he could obtain a partial release of the instinctive tension that was impelling him to act, and so he might gain further delay and a larger interval of forethought. He no longer had to obey automatically the scent of game, for instance. He could pursue the image of the game projected into the future, and postpone until tomorrow his previously insistent predation. And the phantasied pursuit and possession of the game quieted the contraction of his stomach, and became the first aesthetic enjoyment out of which his descendants originated art.

"But now something new began to happen. All the pulls and pushes with which instinct had tied man to his environment began to thresh about like broken tow-lines. Man's desire was no longer tied to specific earthly things; only the horizons of his consciousness limited the range of desire's possible attachments. He was no longer held from dreaming, if he wished, that he was a god like the sun. And fear was similarly freed. Within the limits of his consciousness, he could live like an emperor—or like a fugitive. The thunder no longer simply drove him to his burrow under the impulse of an instinctive fear that left him there, contented. His imagination, now, tried to picture why and from whom this thunder came, and he was assailed by a scepticism that had never tormented him before, because instinctive pull and push had previously excluded doubt.

"Most important of all, man's new consciousness

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowed images of himself to form in his mind and hold his interest, and in these images and pictures of himself he might be far from merely an instinctive earth-bound man. Naturally, he and his descendants came to prefer some of those pictures to the actual figures that they made in the world. In other words, they became acquainted with what you might call 'the fiction of the ideal.' And once any of them had reached that fiction, he would never again be satisfied with the reflection of himself that he saw in the pool. No. For him, the ideal became his true self, and this ideal he would now seek. Even when various sorts of hunger drove him still to play the brute, his mind's eye saw him as a god. His consciousness of himself was the most safe place for him to dwell. Beyond it were depths like abysses. To see himself a god and not a brute required the averted eye. In the depths were monsters, condemned instinctive pulls, animal impulses that were like devils threatening the godliness of the ideal.

"It's no wonder, then, that the study of a man's self became wholly the study of his consciousness—that psychology was wholly the science of the conscious mind. It was so safe and unterrifying. Others might sneer at behavior as animal-like, but the psychologist assured himself that as a man thought, so he was. He saw his consciousness as that something in him which was above the brute. He abstracted his consciousness, in imagination, from his body, and floated it aloft as an immortal soul. He followed it, away from all the earthly behavior that contradicted the fiction of the ideal, and saw himself happy and uncompromised in heaven."

This being so, it's no wonder that man fights against the new psychology when it tries to turn his eyes to the instinctive depths, the animal monsters, the suppressed devils in himself. "Stop!" cries Dr. Churton. "We have succeeded all these years by refusing to acknowledge these things. We have defeated the enemy by blotting him out, in a sort of magic blindness. The consciousness that we have surveyed and mapped so thoroughly is a good and safe place in which to dwell. Let us alone. We live in heaven, and what matter if it be a heaven of our creation. You are trying to plunge us into hell!"

"But what," says Dr. Deere, "what if it were not *we* who have 'succeeded all these years' by virtue of our magical blindness? What if it were nature that has succeeded in preserving us in spite of our blindness? What if she has saved us by some device in ourselves that worked in those very depths which we have ignored? Might it not be possible that if we knew how nature had managed the matter, and we then made that knowledge a part of consciousness, we might come to live in a really happy world that was neither a fictitious heaven nor an animal hell?"

And, indeed, as soon as we begin to watch nature working in our subconsciousness, we see that she has continued to use the old and supposedly discarded instinctive devices of our animal ancestors to save us from the destructive recklessness of the blind ideal. The old instincts have merely disguised themselves as servants of the new master. Behind the throne of consciousness, like the advisers of a Tsar, the real rulers of our inner state have still been the ancient forces of instinctive action that were the governors of the abysmal brute. Consciousness still does their bidding in our behavior, though now their orders come to us "rationalized," as the psychologists say, and presented to us with all the arguments and authority of that old imposter, reason. And our salvation has depended upon the ability of nature thus to use her constructive powers in us, effectively, even when they were hampered by their disguise.

There is nothing in the new psychology that should frighten Dr. Churton. No extension of consciousness can find anything in man that has not always been there. And the new psychology has already made it evident that all man's instinctive and inherited subconscious trends are available for the work of civilization. It remains for man to find out what is the necessary extension of consciousness which he should make in order to assist nature. Once this exploration has been concluded—and the maps have been made and the new knowledge collated—it will then become the business of man's directed intelligence to use his newly discovered resources and liabilities for his highest real good.

And in this work of mapping out man's subconsciousness and collating the knowledge for popular use, the fiction writers of the new school of psychology lend the scientists a valuable aid. Dr. Deere, who gets that aid, enjoys it. He is not worried. He grins at Dr. Churton's terrible frown. "Dr. Churton's ancestor," he says, "who first raised his eyes from the ground—how he must have worried the Churtons of his day who had been living according to their instinctive code of morals for ten times 'the past 1900 years!' How he must have worried them! Oh, wow!"

HARVEY O'HIGGINS.

The Columnist

I'd rather stand important in a swallow
Tailed coat provided by the maison and
Take hats and wraps in the porches of Apollo
(Letting the gentlemen perceive my hand
By accident—the palm a little hollow—
Under the overcoats), I'd rather stand
Here at the door telling the crowd to follow
The golden arrows till they hear the band

Than work inside. Inside they never see
The pretty women in expensive dresses
Who come on tilted heels to dance nor the
Hibernian earls and Iowa princesses,
But carry coals in the old dusty hod—
For what? For nothing but to see the god.

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tweedledemon and Tweedledumbbell

QUIGLEY is a neat, unimpressive little man; his rounded shoulders and thick-lensed spectacles are derived from long association with the ledgers of the Woppington Supply Company which panders to the public craving for wood, coal, flour and feed. To Elmer Durkin, who sits among his newspapers and magazines and looks upon the Woppingtonian scene with a semi-detached eye, there had always been something baffling about Quigley, a vague resemblance to somebody else that haunted Elmer like an almost-remembered name.

On this night in late October Quigley came into the newsstore letting in a breath of brisk autumn air and a bar of band music.

"Well, Quig, what's your alibi? How come you blow in here when Horace W. Witherspoon and the State House gang are saving the Constitution over in Odd Fellows Hall?"

Mr. Quigley seated himself by the stove and revealed hidden depths in his nature. He was not, it now appeared, an obscure and unimportant person after all. He was the man who decided the fate of nations, the man for whom elections were held. He was the balance of power, the independent voter. Four years ago he had revolted from Wilsonism and elected Harding. Now he was about to arise in his wrath and vote for Davis.

"I wear no boss's collar," he declared.

"But you get it in the neck just the same.

"I read the other day that the only difference between the parties is that the Republicans are more crooked and the Democrats more stupid. Tweedledemon and Tweedledumbbell. Maybe; but my dope is that the bird that's hungry only looks honester than the one that's got his face in the chow. It listens all right when Davis ties the oil can to the Grand Old Pachyderm, but there was an awful lot of second-story work pulled in the last chapter, too.

"Now you say if we give these yeggs the air and put in a nice honest Democrat everything will be spiffy. The system you play is that history is only four years old. Quig, if a voter's memory was only built with a longer wheelbase there'd be a slew of politicians hitting the pavement and reading the want ads.

"All the years while you've been doing your flop-timist stuff more and more people have gone sour on the whole game. I know guys in this burg who stick around home on election day if they never show there at any other time. Take Jack Biddle, the type-hound in the Woppingtonian shop. The tickets that old egg has refused to chuck into the box would paper the dining-room."

"That's all wrong," said Quigley. "Every citizen should vote.

"Right enough, but I don't blame folks for passing up politics. The issues are so balled up that a cross-word puzzle fiend couldn't get jake to them. What's this cruel war about anyhow?

"Coolidge hands us a flock of cold-storage words about religion and obedience and the Red Cross and the Continental Congress and Heinz's pickle works, but on political questions, he's about as chatty as an oyster. Davis spouts about common honesty, but he hasn't walked off with the show on that act. Dawes says the campaign is all about how La Follette is a Bolshy, and the next big noise from the grass-root country is the sound of Iowa Republicans busting out of the bungalow. Secretary Wilbur has a brainstorm about shooting Japs, and he gets the merry old hook. Harry Daugherty tries to tell the world his troubles but they clap the muffler on him pronto. In Indiana they think it's the K-K-K-Katies. According to Teddy Roosevelt the paramountainous issue is whether he was ever in France. Where is there any nourishment in that mess?

"How can you have a high-class war between side-steppers and buck-passers? The old parties look to me like a couple of has-been pugs afraid to trade wallops and splitting the gate fifty-fifty. Every fillum is a slow-motion picture and all the broadcasting is from Station BLAH. They're both fighting with their backs to the Wall Street, and the best we can get out of it is the short end."

"What do you suppose will be the result, Elmer?"

"I can't dope this one for sour apples. There's something phony about it. Nobody seems to be spending much jack and the lack of excitement is intense, yet registrations have been hitting the high spots. Butler is claiming everything from Duluth to the Tropic of Cancer, but Hughes is hanging out the 'Help Wanted' sign. There's more knee-shaking that hand-shaking in this campaign. Maybe the winning cards are still on the board. A lot depends on how much ice La Follette cuts—and whose ice."

"There are only two real parties," said Quigley. "When one disgraces itself, we must turn it out and put in the other."

"And versa vica," laughed Elmer.

When the bookkeeper departed he left behind him a contented man, for Elmer had solved a perplexing problem. He knew now why Quigley looked so familiar; he was an important citizen of Cartoonerville. Not the side-whiskered banker, nor the high-booted farmer, nor the workingman with the square cap, but the taxpayer, the average voter, the plain citizen, the Common People—well-meaning, honest, pathetically hopeful and, in Elmer's deplorable phrase, "a glutton for bad news."

FELIX RAY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

California Justice

SIR: Early in the summer we broadcasted to the world by means of special circulars and advertisements in the liberal magazines—Nation, New Republic, Survey, and World Tomorrow—the news of the outrageous attack upon the I. W. W. by the mob at San Pedro on June 14, and the utter failure of the authorities to search out and punish the perpetrators of such barbaric lawlessness. . . . You will all be gratified to learn that mob violence has not broken out again here as it did on the fateful night in June. . . . But all has not been lovely during the summer. Persecutions against the I. W. W. have continued unabated—by the police. Three unwarranted raids have been staged. Policemen have entered three private houses in San Pedro, where it was suspected I. W. W. were staying or had supplies of literature, and the civil rights of the occupants of the places were ruthlessly pushed aside and trampled upon.

More than that, a form of petty persecution against the members of this hated organization has been kept up continuously during the past three months. One of the San Pedro policemen is alleged to have remarked: "We'll keep you wobblies in jail nine months out of the twelve awaiting trials or dismissals." That appears to be exactly what the police department, in conjunction with the courts, is trying to do. Ninety-one arrests have occurred between June 28 and September 30. Most of the men were taken while selling I. W. W. papers—The Industrial Worker, Industrial Solidarity and The Industrial Pioneer. All of these publications, by the way, enjoy full mailing privileges under the federal government. Seventy-three of the men were charged with volating the Busick injunction. . . .

Twenty-eight of the Busick injunction cases have been called to trial—only to be forthwith dismissed, some of them several days before the actual date set for their trial. Thereby the authorities frankly admit that they dare not submit the cases against these men to a jury of their peers; the cases are too flimsy. . . .

Thirty-two cases are now pending. No one can of course positively forecast just what disposition will be made of them. It is safe, though, to say that the powers that be will cause these men every possible annoyance while they have them in custody, even if they dismiss them as rapidly as they come up. George Speed, for instance, was required to come all the way from Seattle to Los Angeles, merely to be told that his case was dismissed. Prof. Leo Gallagher, not an I. W. W. but a member of our American Civil Liberties Union, was arrested on the afternoon of July 4th, whle presiding at a free speech meeting on the streets of San Pedro. For simply holding an I. W. W. song book in his hand he was taken to the local bastile and incarcerated, charged with violating the Busick injunction. Cash bail of $500 was obtained and he was released near midnight of the same day. His case was dismissed several days before it was to have come up on September 8.

Edward Moffett, while speaking at the same meeting over which Prof. Gallagher was presiding, took occasion to exhibit some photos showing the havoc wrought by the mob on June 14th and to criticise the officials for not bringing the perpetrators to justice. He, too, was grabbed by the police and held in jail for nine days before arrignment. Finally he was charged with disturbing the peace, and his case went to trial. The jury brought in a verdict of not guilty after being out for only two or three minutes. . . .

The situation here is intolerable. For police and other officials to thus arrogate to themselves such autocratic powers is an affront of the first order to all who believe in our constitutional rights. Several suits have been instituted on behalf of the victims of this lawlessness, but it will take both time and money to press them to an effective conclusion. Not in any spirit of vindictiveness, but as a matter of social obligation we are advising a vigorous prosecution of these cases. Southern California is today a strategic battleground in the whole American revolt against the tyranny of the police and the courts in their subservience to the ruthlessness of big profiteering corporations. This throttling of civil liberties by the money power must be stoutly resisted and done away with. We need your continued fellowship and assistance in this work.

CLINTON J. TAFT,
Director, Southern California Branch,
American Civil Liberties Union.

Los Angeles, Cal.

"Let Us Go Back"

SIR: If the following is worth space in your correspondence columns or elsewhere, use it. If it isn't, I know your waste basket must be large.

The cry of "Let us go back" has an ominous sound to any one who recalls some of the facts of history. It has been the real slogan of Egypt and China for two or three thousands years. "Let us go back" to our task-masters and slavery was the cry of the cowardly Hebrew slaves when difficulty beset them on their way to freedom from bondage. That generation of them perished in the Wilderness; they never entered the Promised Land.

After July 4th, 1776, there were those in America who said "Let us go back" to the rule of Mother England. But they were the Tories. After 1789 there were those in France who said "Let us go back" to the days of privilege and power. But they were not the masses. The motto carried out by the Congress of Vienna was "Let us go back," and reactionary governments of Europe did all that governments could do to turn the clock of progress back. But they fought for a lost cause. In 1822 Spain, backed by the Holy Alliance, said "Let us go back," but South America and Monroe and Channing believed in progress.

"Let us go back" has been the cry of feudal lords, of guild masters, of absolute rulers, of landed nobility. It has ever been the cry of power and privilege in defeat. It is the cry of German monarchists and militarists today.

Those who love life and freedom and progress will beware of the leadership of men or parties that say, "Let us go back."

O. L. KEENER.

Berea, Ky.

Congress and the Supreme Court

SIR: In relation to Dawes's vociferous assertions that La Follette is seeking to overthrow the Constitution, you might, more or less gently, call his attention to Section 2 of Article III of the Constitution of the United States. Therein occurs the statement that, with minor exceptions: "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and *under such regulations as the Congress shall make.*"

Shall we assume that Dawes, and others of the Republican ballyhoo, are unacquainted with this section of the Constitution, or shall we assume that they are deliberately misrepresenting? Either horn of the dilemma is sufficiently discreditable.

A. D. BUSH.

Decatur, Ga.

The Tactful Crusader

SIR: Probably most friends have learned of Professor Zueblin's death here, where he was hoping to recuperate for his coming engagements. I am sure that thousands of his countrymen would have been deeply thankful could they have had the opportunity to join the handful who did gather by Lake Geneva to mingle their affectionate memories of him.

Few Americans of this century have been more widely and gratefully known in their own land. For nearly thirty years he had occupied the American lecture platform, and always as an agitator for more adventurous and finer social development. He was witty and brilliant, but characteristically to give effect to an appeal, not to entertain. Of how many who win public attention could it be remarked: "He was continually risking his reputation in what he said" But that was Zueblin. He rarely if ever failed to make some, or perchance many, in his audience shake their heads in disgust. He lectured to persuade toward greater moral enterprise. He was for advance, not contentment. He was always thinking and urging causes—children's playgrounds, votes for women, the League of Nations. Life was a tactful crusade. The common people, too, liked his courage, and it was their life that he wanted to see refreshed.

There was a fitness in his ashes being returned to the land of his fathers, the land which he loved to visit. There was a fitness too in the simple services held. The singing was only by the insects in the grass, the birds in the sunny trees—the increasing voices. His long educational work is a part of the eternal building forces henceforth. His internationalism has its new and great promise embodied at this fittingly chosen seat of the League of Nations.

GEORGE E. HOOKER.

Geneva, Switzerland.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Father of Schoolmasters

IT used to be said that Aristotle understood something or other as no other man before or since has done. Was it substance or division? I have forgotten. While loafing through Professor Ross's volume, entitled Aristotle as a guide book is entitled Spain, or Volley Ball, I have been trying to recall the reputed triumph of Greek thought; but like the golden hour of the copy books it is lost beyond recovery. Probably the pocket of the mind in which it rested was a ragged one. A boy improved against his will is of the same complexion still. Not that I should have fulminated against Sir Henry Maine's dogma that all that is best in modern civilization has come to us from the Greeks. For—yes, we all like bananas.

Indeed, I have always been distinctly fond of Aristotelian logic. More resolute souls, the class poet and the full back of the foot ball team took a violent repugnance to the inanity of the thing and were plucked, struggling to the last for some clue to the meaning of life. Alas, none is extractable from logic! They had been caught in the current of the moral tradition in undergraduate life. You played foot ball in those days with Teddy's clarion call, "Hit the line hard!" ringing in your ears and a vision of yourself plunging a senatorial opposition for a Great Cause. The syllogism is no good for such a temperamental climate. Yet played with the proper detachment it can be a highly amusing game.

You play it with three "propositions" and six "terms." Any one can make his own, though the familiar ones are as follows:

All men are mortal.
Socrates is a man.
Therefore Socrates is mortal.

The various pieces and displays go by an elaborate nomenclature peculiar to the game, as is always the case, and a large part of the fun comes in using the proper expression to suit each move. What satisfaction is there in merely blundering through to a win without being able to murmur gently but knowingly to your worsted opponent, "Illicit minor; you can't convert A's except by limitation, you know."

The Socrates of the syllogism has nothing to do with the historic personage of that name. It is simply a white knight or a knave of hearts. Indeed, the leaping and tumbling for which it may be called upon would ill suit the grave Attic philosopher. Thus but little skill and only an elementary knowledge of "obversion" are required to put Socrates in this interesting condition:

All non-mortals are non-human.
Some non-Socrates is non-human.
Therefore some non-mortal is non-Socrates.

Which must be allowed to pass without contradiction as bearing the stamp of Aristotle: valid!

Of course our debt to the Greeks has been out at compound interest too long not to have accumulated a pretty considerable fund of undistributed dividends. Aristotle himself would hardly know his game as it is now played, on horseback so to speak, with algebra and the theory of functions as mounts and the "null class" and infinity as goal posts. For speed and intricacy the performances of such a virtuoso as Bertrand Rusell quite outclass the best mediaeval records. Consider the situation of Socrates in the play described by Philip Jourdain, the most literary of the followers of the sport of philosophers:

> There is an instant t such that t has not to Socrates the one-many relation R which is the converse of the relation "exists at," and all instants following t have not the relation R to Socrates, and there is at least one instant t' such that neither t' nor any instant preceding t' has the relation R to Socrates.

Socrates is now t-ed up and ready for play.

The marvel is that with all this virtuosity the purity of the sport has been maintained. No charges of commercialism have ever been preferred against the game or its exponents. To be sure, a writer of advertising copy for the Dial magazine recently spoke of Mr. Russell's realism "in which logic, with the help of modern mathematics, becomes a really dependable instrument for investigation." But "investigation" is not used in the Scotland Yard sense of the word. All that has been investigated to date is the ultimate nature of the universe. By the help of Socrates and the null class, Mr. Russell has obtained a certain stock of Independent Reals, while his colleague, Mr. Whitehead, has succeeded in reducing the cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces, the solemn temples, the great globe itself, yea, all which it inherit, to the elementary-space-time-point-event, which he is now coming over to exhibit to the students of Harvard University. But brilliant as these "investigations" are, the space-time-point-event is not yet on a commercial basis as a household utility. So far bananas hold the field.

But in spite of the interest which every inquiring mind, free from the shackles of foot ball and poetry, must take in the syllogism I feel sure that it was not Aristotle's premier performance. Others have understood it only too well. Perhaps the ne plus ultra was his sublime conception of God. Professor Ross lays particular stress on the fact that no one has ever made that out. Some think Aristotle's God was a final cause, others that He was an efficient cause. Ross inclines to a compromise view. On another issue, though, the bias of the Oxford don is more pronounced. Two famous German professors debated for years whether Aristotle's God was theistic or not. Ross definitely favors the negative on this point. Aristotle must be recognized as the conceiver of an atheistic God.

But Aristotle's supreme achievement, I am sure, was the technique of classification. He was the discoverer of the pedagogical axiom, divide and teach. As he himself remarked, "The happy life is not one of search for truth, but one of contemplation of truth already attained." It is the father of schoolmasters who is speaking. What a riot of variegated classifications his textbooks are! Professor de Wulf has written ecstatically that there is scarcely a classification in use by schoolmasters today that did not originate with Aristotle. "Compared with Aristotle—the most brilliant teacher whom humanity has ever known—Plato is only a poet, saying beautiful things without order or method." Alas, too true! Long cheer for Professor Aristotle; hip! hip! "Substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, date, position, state, action, passivity! Aristotle! Aristotle! Aristotle!"

On the opening page of his book about the electron, Millikan, the physicist, speaks of "the greatest of the Greeks—Thales." Now there is a real authority for you! All of his writings have been lost.

C. E. A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mark Twain's Autobiography

Mark Twain's Autobiography, with an Introduction by Albert Bigelow Paine. Two vols. New York: Harper and Brothers. $10.

IN his preface to this book, Mark Twain tells us he is speaking As From the Grave, "rather than with my living tongue, for a good reason: I can speak thence freely. When a man is writing a book dealing with the privacies of his life—a book which is to be read while he is still alive—he shrinks from speaking his whole frank mind . . . It has seemed to me that I could be as frank and free and unembarrassed as a love letter if I knew that what I was writing would be exposed to no eye until I was dead, and unaware, and indifferent."

These serious, honest words prepare us for revelations, both of self and of the endless procession of other people Mark Twain knew and did business with; for verbal horsewhippings administered to absent enemies, for a frank, complete, searching accounting of his own life and soul, for a dozen secrets about himself which this garrulous salad of recollections ignores, or chooses to forget, or merely hints at. That solemn prefatory promise is hardly lived up to, and what we learn about Mark Twain from himself is pleasant, or touching, or tedious, or explicit, or narrative, but not very illuminating. There could be no better comment on these scattered chapters, written or dictated at all sorts of times and places between 1870 and 1906, than his own:

> What a wee little part of a person's life are his acts and his words! His real life is led in his head, and is known to none but himself. All day long, and every day, the mill of his brain is grinding, and his *thoughts*, not those other things, are his history . . . The mass of him is hidden—it and its volcanic fires that toss and boil, and never rest, night nor day. These are his life, and they are not written, and cannot be written . . . Biographies are but the clothes and buttons of the man—the biography of the man himself cannot be written.

Not even a biography of himself, by a man who has such rare powers of insight? Will Mark Twain tell us only of his clothes and buttons? Will be sink a deep shaft into the well of himself, or will he describe with endless detail the story of how he got the contract for General Grant's Memoirs, and follow with many "I remembers" the old lecture circuit, and catalogue the furniture in his Florence palace, and respeak old speeches, and be vaguely, tensely tender about his wife, his mother, and quote far too much from his young daughter's biography of her father, and read long letters into the record, and overflow with the sterling qualities of departed friends, and take a dozen approach shots toward a humorous anecdote, and retreat from it lovingly with many backward glances, and pass dim, happy years before him in multitudinous review?

"The mass of him is hidden." The old volcano dictates for the most part only amiable, rather interesting smoke. But every now and then comes a rumble, a flash, and several gallons of real lava:

> H—— is a great, fat, good-natured, kind-hearted, chicken-livered slave; with no more pride than a tramp, no more sand than a rabbit, no more moral sense than a wax figure, and no more sex than a tapeworm.

There were a good many Mark Twain's, and these volumes show us nearly all of them. There is the generous vitriol poured out upon H——; there is his boiling, extended indignation at the murder of the 600 Filipinos; there are his business regrets and successes, shrewd and circumstantial, and the pleasant, but not too important taste of dollars upon his tongue; there is his boundless, brooding affection, his sudden excoriating contempt, and all degrees of charity, amusement, irony and dislike which lie between; there is the vast exaggerative humor, which makes one laugh when it comes off, and sounds like a bad habit when it doesn't; there is his profound humility before men he considers really great, like General Grant, and his tranquil basking in the warmth of lesser, but still eminent society ("by all odds the most notable banquet . . . speakers . . . of a rare celebrity and ability,") there is his perverse ridicule of foreign oddities, and his great tolerance for oddity in any given individual; there is, best of all, in snatches here and there, his inimitable sympathy and eye for the early American scene, for those most distant and most sharply remembered days, when whiskey was ten cents a gallon, when he endured scorn as "a boy seven years old who can't chew tobacco," when anything larger than a peach would drop through the puncheon floor; when "everybody was poor, but didn't know it; and everybody was comfortable, and did know it."

In his recollection of later times there is much to trouble and blur his vision, attempt and failure, death, and the presence of figures, too dear or too annoying for calm portraiture, but for those very early days his affection is clear sighted as a man's, whole-hearted as a boy's. They are gone, but with the knowledge that they are gone no regret seems mingled, for he can always bring them back in vigorous, charming detail almost as well for his reader's as for his own mind's eye. Just as Huckleberry Finn is probably the best of all his books, so these chapters of the autobiography stand out above the chaos of obituary, diary, anecdote, genealogy, catalogue and affection. They were written, for one thing, not dictated (a method which Mark Twain did not like, nor, judging from the results, ever accomplish successfully), and they are well written.

> I can call back the prairie, and its loneliness and peace, and a vast hawk hanging motionless in the sky, with its wings spread wide and the blue of the vault showing through their end feathers.

The chapter in which this passage occurs—it is called Early Days—is about the best in the two volumes, and this sentence is only one of many which recall the wild happy pioneer days, full of coon-hunts and good food well earned and boyish adventures, as if they were yesterday. He has two ways of talking about those times; one, simple, solid, direct and charming, with humor occasionally, but no straining after it, no facetionsness; the other, rather mildly boisterous and exaggerated anecdote. They mark the division within himself which appears so clearly in Huckleberry Finn, where a grand and living story of Americans and a great river surrenders to elaborate practical jokes upon the entrance of Tom Sawyer.

ROBERT LITTELL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Modern Mexico

Mexico: An Interpretation, by Carleton Beals. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $2.50.

THIS is much more than a brilliantly written apologia for the Obregon régime. It is a very suggestive analysis of the forces which have created modern Mexico. It is an interpretation, sometimes profound and always interesting, of the social, economic, religious and political tendencies which are struggling for the mastery south of the Rio Grande today.

The author, though employed in Mexico City in "various educational and literary capacities," unlike many writers on Mexican affairs, does not base his conclusions primarily on observations in the cities. His experiences were rich and varied. He traveled "by foot, horseback or train through fifteen of the Mexican states, in many places living for a time with the Indians." During the last months of the Carranza administration, he was employed as instructor to members of the presidential staff. He witnessed the "Obregon revolution and followed closely the developments during the first six months of the De la Huerta administration. The material on Spain was collected as a result of nearly a year's residence in that country."

The volume is divided into four parts: "Background," "Rise of the Mexican People," "The Social Fabric," and "The Foreign Invasion." It opens with a rarely sympathetic and illuminating study of "The Indian Heritage." Then follows a bitterly critical account of the Spanish régime, the period from the conquest until independence was achieved early in the Nineteenth Century. Beals tends to emphasize only what was bad in the work of Spain during these hundreds of years. His account should be supplemented by the reading of Bourne's "Spain and America," a volume in "The American Nation" series. Spain's achievements in Mexico were very real and will always remain an integral part of the life of the country, especially the Spanish language, law and institutions, and the Roman religion.

Unfortunately, independence brought neither freedom nor peace for the Mexican masses. Spanish autocracy was merely replaced by the "crude despotism ridiculously cloaked in the toga of republicanism . . . Excluding the thirty-year rule of Diaz, in sixty-eight years some seventy changes occurred in the dictatorship! Seventy national upheavals all in the name of liberty—the reign of Diaz was in many respects preferable . . . Yet two Mexican revolutions have had "profound significance in the struggle for human freedom: the revolution of Juárez and the revolution of 1910-20."

It was Juárez, "shepherd, book-maker, student of divinity, lawyer, governor of Oaxaca, head of the Supreme Court, head of the revolutionary army, president emancipator," who first "cut deep into the roots of the evil tree of class privilege with sure understanding of the needs of his country. His Constitution of 1857, together with the Reform Laws of 1859, brought the Reformation to Mexico . . . The people will never again, for any great length of time, bow down to the old Creole-Church-State Trinity or permit the re-creation of a powerful landed aristocracy."

During the thirty years of Diaz's dictatorship, much of Juárez's work was undone. Beals's prevailing point of view and his power of graphic analysis is illustrated by his summation of Diaz's achievements. "Through the re-creation of a landed aristocracy and the re-establishment of the Church power, through his violation of the ejido (village communal land), his stifling of all personal liberty, his direct interference in local affairs through the jefe politico (local boss), and the contract system of the Cientificos, Diaz ignited a smouldering fury in the common heart . . . Yet Diaz was in the grip of a belated industrial revolution that no man could have forestalled. Diaz merely accelerated an inevitable process. The virtues of his administration were incident to its evils."

When Diaz grew old, the insecurity of his achievements at once became evident. The vast and imposing modern industrial civilization which he built up was but a facade hiding the adobe hut of Mexican illiteracy, misery and social unrest. He was, therefore, easily overthrown by the idealistic but impractical Madero. This dreamer was in turn destroyed by the drunken Huerta, while the reactionary American ambassador, Henry Lane Wilson, refused to move a finger to prevent this brutal assassination.

Towards Carranza, Beals is even less sympathetic than in his analysis of Diaz. He takes cognizance not at all of the enormous difficulties which Carranza faced. He condemns the Sonora patriarch unqualifiedly. He charges that Carranza attacked organized labor; forced out of his Cabinet "every honest element of the revolution; and pursued a Wilsonian tactic that, however high-minded may have been his intentions, dogged his every act with the prophecy of failure and foretold that personal ambition and egotistical self-assurance could not replace the organized coöperative efforts of a people." As a result, "his rule was to vanish in the wreck of foundations ever narrowed by animosity, suppression of political rights, persecutions, and the scourging of the sincere revolutionary elements, plus favoritism toward sycophantic, treacherous self-seekers."

This unrestrained denunciation of a man who, though doubtless stubborn and in some respects conservative, was nevertheless one of the foremost leaders of the revolution, is not the judgment of a dispassionate historian. It is a colorful interpretation from the Obregonista viewpoint. Indeed, Obregon, the leader of the "revindicating revolution," is the author's hero. Nevertheless, his analysis of that revolution is penetrating and probably basically sound. It has not been, he says, at any time a Bolshevik experiment. "It is above all else a conservative revolution. It represents a profound reaction to the industrial and commercial invasion of the United States and Western civilization. Diaz so accelerated the industrial revolution in his country as to shatter disastrously the social order. Socially, educationally, racially, temperamentally, the Mexican people were not prepared for such a tremendous break with the traditions of centuries. The climate, the character of the national resources, the geographical relativity have further militated against such a change, inevitable though it may ultimately be. The Madero-Obregon revolution, while motivated by ideas of democracy, of industrial freedom, of socialism, has nevertheless, in its more fundamental race-motivated aspects, clamped the brakes on a runaway industrialism; it has attempted to hold the country back from a too violent departure from the agrarian-communistic, semi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oriental traditions of the race and the nation . . . For this reason the agrarian achievements of the revindicating revolution have been of supreme importance. They will either make a great Mexico through an ultimate modernization of the ejido system; or they will prove as disastrously conservative as the industrial innovations of Diaz were disastrously disruptive."

The brief but suggestive chapters on "The Social Fabric" are intensely interesting. In each of these a bright, though sometimes slightly lurid light, due to the author's ardent sympathy for the present régime, is thrown on the fundamentals of Mexican life. In his concluding three chapters, "The Foreigner," "American Capital" and "The United States Government," he writes from an ultra-critical point of view. With many of the details of this bitter arraignment, the reviewer cannot agree. But there are few men or women in the United States who would not profit by reading Beals's scathing indictment of that self-seeking, ignorant and blind disregard of Mexico's interests which have too often characterized the actions of our people and of our Government towards Mexico.

Fortunately, since the publication of this volume, much real progress has been made towards better relations of the two peoples through the refunding of the Mexican national debt and the extension by our Government of formal recognition. But the fundamental problems of United States-Mexican relations still remain unsolved. Can American influence—religious, educational, philanthropic—and the personal goodwill of exceptionally liberal and broad-minded individual financiers effectively coöperate with the Mexican people in helping them "to stand upon their feet before the world as free men and women, as prosperous, happy and dignified individuals, as masters of their own destiny?"

James G. McDonald.

A Philosophic Critic

Latitudes, by Edwin Muir. New York: B. W. Huebsch. $2.00.

AMONG the many good things that were interred with the bones of The Freeman, Mr. Edwin Muir's essays had a high place; and it is a pleasure to find some of them recovered and preserved in the present volume.

Mr. Muir shares with Mr. Conrad Aiken the distinction of being one of a handful of contemporary critics who are capable of discussing literature with philosophic point and profundity; more than that, he writes about æsthetics without using the monotonous tags of the "æstheticians," and in his own person he combines the three functions of the critic as he lays them down in the essay on The Psychology of Criticism—to feel beauty when he sees it, to examine and find whether it is the true beauty, and to discover the significance that it holds. Subtle, tactful, penetrating, Mr. Muir's mind is of that rare order which reveals its own contours by disclosing those of the subject it approaches.

As literary critic, and as a philosophic essayist with a metaphysic of his own, Mr. Muir is equally interesting. His essays on his countrymen, Robert Burns and George Douglas, and upon the Scotch ballads have that freshness of understanding which is the test of intellectual maturity; his notes on Dostoyevsky, Conrad, and Ibsen are just and good; and his comment on Janko Lavrin's Nietzsche, coming as it does from a critic whose first volume bore the stamp of Zarathustra, is a fine piece of detached appreciation. In the philosophic essays Mr. Muir writes with a bolder hand; he claims his own ground. He writes against profundity, against the morbid soul-burrowings of Messrs. Anderson, Lawrence, and Joyce; he attacks the reign of superstition, by which he means the delight in spurious mystery and the renunciation of the intellect; he makes a defense of new truths in an attempt to head off his contemporaries from a relapse into a safe and settled world—but why should one attempt to photograph the movements of Mr. Muir's mind? He has recorded them himself, and I heartily recommend them to every reader who has a touch of philosophy in him.

All the shafts of Mr. Muir's thought fly outward from a central assumption. It comes out most clearly perhaps, this central assumption, in the essay on The Truth About Art. "Why do we find pleasure in works of art?" asks Mr. Muir. "Because," he answers, "in them existence is made to appear as play . . . In art we enjoy the whole universe, we enjoy even ourselves as spectacle, as play. The condition of entering this world is that we should leave every necessity and every duty behind us." Again, in a discourse On the Universe, Mr. Muir says: "To raise order out of chaos was a sign of vitality, but the complete achievement of the highest vitality is shown when we put all organization beneath us, and use it easily and gracefully, as if in play. Play is the final form of vitality." Finally, in the essay "De L'Amour": "The lover 'walks on air' with the flimsy excuse that he loves and is loved by a mere woman, one among the many millions who love or are loved on this star. He is raised to a unique capacity for life; he does the most foolish, most heroic things; and is generous even to the length of throwing away his life for the safety of his beloved's. This is because life has suddenly become play. It is no longer a matter of mere necessity, of mere task and duty. An immemorial exuberance of life fills everything, so that the world is "transfigured;" and at the same time the lover to whom existence has become a mere beautiful agon, can cast off his life simply because to do this might appear the most beautiful thing."

Obviously, the nub of Mr. Muir's philosophy is both monstrous and delightful. If taken in anything but its own playful metaphysical spirit, it might be used to justify the most hideous negations of life: under its protection murder might blossom forth as a fine art, and war would appear as an exhilarating pastime which quickens the tempo of life, a pastime whose pragmatic ends are as irrelevant to its enjoyment as the pins and matches children use at cards. Appreciated in Mr. Muir's context, however, this philosophy of play brings forth the very sense of release and heightened vitality that play itself does: it carries its own sanctions! Whereas the older school of utilitarians came finally to see with Herbert Spencer that even play has a use, Mr. Muir offers the profounder suggestion that all uses are a kind of play, and that our necessities, when confronted in the proper spirit, verge on the beautiful inane. In the light of this philosophy, love and literature again wear an Olympian aspect; for there is nothing so foolish that it may not be divine. By weaving all his threads around this metaphysical point, Mr. Muir has created a unique philosophical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Personal Narrative of Kerensky's Secretary, Later Proscribed, Hunted For Four Years And Finally Expelled

Leaves From a Russian Diary

By PITIRIM SOROKIN

Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota

The narrative of a man who was an important factor in the 1917 Revolution, Kerensky's Secretary and editor of the official newspaper of that Revolution. Later he was proscribed by the Bolsheviki, twice arrested, condemned to death, saved only by a former student's intervention. For four years he was a hunted man. In 1922 he was finally expelled from Russia. It is an amazing but convincing picture of what life in Russia is like today.

One of the earliest readers of the manuscript reported: "This should be published as quickly as possible. It ought to be read by every High School boy and girl—by every farmer and every working man—by every clerk, teacher, and thinker."

It definitely puts before you Russia as it is today. Price $3.00

My Brother's Face
By DHAN MUKERJI
A review of the new restless India against the background of the India of the ages. Only a Hindu born could understand it. Only one who has lived in America could interpret it. $3.00

The Collapse of Central Europe
By DR. KARL NOWAK
"A very brilliant book." Lord Haldane says. He finds it "profoundly interesting and important." $8.00

Behind the Scenes in Politics
Will give you many a good story to tell of campaigns and their managers, political spellbinders, traps that have caught unwary politicians, wives as candidates' assets or liabilities. The book is anonymous, but obviously the work of an experienced campaign manager. $2.50

The Foreign Policies of Soviet Russia
By ALFRED L. P. DENNIS
Who of your acquaintances can speak of them with authority. No book on the subject approaches this in value. $5.00

TO INSPIRE THE THOUGHTFUL AND ADD ZEST TO DAILY CONTACTS—

Daedalus
By J. B. S. HALDANE $1.00

Icarus
By BERTRAND RUSSELL $1.00

The Mongol in Our Midst
By F. G. CROOKSHANK, M. D. $1.50

Wireless Possibilities
By Prof. A. M. LOW $1.00

Others to follow.

My Duel with the Vatican
By ALFRED LOISY
A moving account of a courageous struggle of the highest importance and interest at the present moment of world-wide conflict between Modernism and Fundamentalism. $3.00

Unmailed Letters
By JOSEPH H. ODELL
Sympathetic, sensitive letters on just such matters as are likely to come up when the talk of thinking men drifts from one topic to another, full of striking sentences any one of which is a starting point for an interesting discussion. $2.50

Episodes Before Thirty
By ALGERNON BLACKWOOD
William Rose Benet finds it "a human document which challenges comparison with the best realistic novels." Third edition, $2.50

The Story of My Heart
By RICHARD JEFFERIES
A spiritual autobiography which most book-lovers know as the most intense and moving record of a human soul. Illustrated from wood engravings by Ethelbert White. $4.00

Women and Leisure
By LORINE PRUETTE, Ph.D.
A study of social waste—a book for the woman whose fine capacity for work is not satisfied by her part-time job in the home. $3.00

Experimental Practice in the City and Country School
Edited by CAROLINE PRATT
with a record of Group Seven by Lulu E. Wright. From it the reader gains a clear idea of the types of activities, the methods, the daily life in this unusual school. $2.50

The Fox's Paw
By RAMON PEREZ DE AYALA
HENRY BESTON: "To be successful his theme is one which requires a treatment at once poetic and psychological. This he has accomplished in quite an extraordinary way." $2.50

The Widow's House
By KATHLEEN COYLE
The Literary Review: "A wonderful book, a radiant book filled with pity and understanding . . . a brave book . . . true to all that is fine in women and in living." $2.00

Thomas the Lambkin
By CLAUDE FARRERE
The New York Evening Post: "One of the most stirring tales of Corsairs we have ever read—a powerful, full-bodied tale of sea fights and amorous adventures . . . a book that once begun will not be put down until it is finished." $2.00

The Dream of Fair Women
By HENRY WILLIAMSON
A remarkable love story by an author who already has a notable reputation. "Good," says **The Manchester Guardian,** "very good indeed." $2.50

So Human
By DON HEROLD
Humorous sketches on everything from "Painless Living" to "Russia's Roughest Composer"—a valuable antidote to gloom. $2.00

Love's and Losses of Pierrot
By WILLIAM GRIFFITH
Light and delicate verses by the editor of **Current Opinion**—a refreshing tonic in days of rush and pressure. $2.00

These books can be had at any bookstore, or, if not, from

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY, Publishers, 681 Fifth Ave., NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tapestry. Whether this gay fabric of Mr. Muir's will cover the walls of the universe I am not quite sure; somehow the universe contrives sooner or later to escape the meshes of dialectics, or at any rate to expose a blank space that has not been covered. It is enough that Mr. Muir has bravely upset all the utilitarian values which custom, and daily necessity, and the logic of science have been patiently erecting; for to upset the existing system is perhaps the chief use of a new system. Mr. Muir has described a philosopher as "a man who habitually asks himself absurd and shameless questions—and who answers them in perfect seriousness." It is an epigram to put alongside Mr. Bertrand Russell's definition of a mathematician: Mr. Muir *is* a philosopher.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

The Horns of Elfland

The King of Elfland's Daughter, by Lord Dunsany. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.00.

THE story of how Alaric of Erl married the Elf-King's daughter is a simple story fit for an old man to tell in simple language on an early evening. But it is a dangerous story to be written in a book. For it is made up of the inexpressible moods and magics that only children know, yet it is not written for children. It has no shadow of allegory on the life side to make it healthy fare for grown men and women, but only pictures and imaginings that hark them back to the Golden Age when these gossamer things had reality and leave them aching for the glory and the dream. There is no homeliness, no jocularity from the world, such as James Stephens knows how to use, to break the exquisite rhythmical monotony of the telling. It is too thin for Lord Dunsany. The horns of Elfland, indeed, but oh, how faintly blowing!

E. V.

Contributors

WALTER LIPPMANN, formerly an editor of the New Republic, is now on the staff of the New York World. He contributes to current periodicals, and is the author of Liberty and the News and Public Opinion.

CHESTER ROWELL, former editor of the Fresno Republican, was a delegate to the Progressive National Convention of 1912 and 1916, and chairman of the Republican State Committee, 1916-18.

HARVEY O'HIGGINS's latest book, Julie Crane, has just been published by Harpers.

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH is a graduate of Yale (1916) and of Harvard Law School. His last book of poems, The Happy Marriage, was published last spring.

JAMES G. MCDONALD, chairman of the Foreign Policy Association since 1919, conferred with President Obregon and other prominent Mexican officials in October, 1921.

LEWIS MUMFORD, a frequent contributor to the New Republic, is the author of The Story of Utopia and Sticks and Stones.

ELIZABETH DUNCAN SCHOOL

New Palace, Park of Sans-Souci Potsdam-Berlin

An International School

Mental and Physical Training

Special attention to all arts including dancing

Tuition and board $65 to $80 a month

Apply to Miss Gertrud Drueck, 46 West 40th St., N. Y.

American Branch under supervision of

MISS GERTRUD DRUECK

Cources in dancing from October to May

CARNEGIE HALL STUDIO 61, NEW YORK

RAND SCHOOL
7 E. 15th St.

Courses beginning:
Nov. 10, 8:30 P.M. . . . . Marius Hanseme
"The World We Live In"
Nov. 11, 8:30 P.M. . . . . Algernon Lee
Senior Seminar "Social Theories and Movements"
Nov. 13, 7:00 P.M. . . . . Scott Nearing
"Current Opinion"
Nov. 14, 8:30 P.M. . . . . Herman Epstein
"With the Great Composers"
Nov. 15, 11:00 A.M. and 1:30 P.M. . . . . Scott Nearing
"Dynamic Sociology" and "Current History"
Nov. 26, 8:30 P.M. . . . . Johan Smertenko
"Current Drama"
Beginning Nov. 1st—Saturday afternoon lectures: J. F. Horrabin on "H. G. Wells"; Carleton Beals, "Latin America"; Vint Laughland, "Social Religion"; Roberto Haberman, "Mexico"; Clarence Darrow, "Crime."
Debate Nov. 30th—Clarence Darrow vs. Scott Nearing: "Is the Human Race Worth Working for?"

Hundreds Stand in Line in Philadelphia to Buy THE SUNDAY TRANSCRIPT. This Is Not True as to Any Other Publication on Earth. Never Solicited an Advertisement in Seventy-five Years. Six different copies for Twenty-five cents. Sunday Transcript, Philadelphia, Pa.

F. M. HOLLY
AUTHORS' REPRESENTATIVE
MOTION PICTURE AGENT
156 Fifth Avenue, New York
Rates and full information sent upon application.

ASSISTANT OR COMPANION—Young man, taste for science, philosophy, seeks position. Experience in museum work. Typist. Knowledge of gardening, various hobbies, etc. Address Box 286, New Republic.

REST, RECREATION—College woman's farm; 25 miles from city; delightful location; hills west of Hudson. Receives professional women for week-ends. Rates, $3.00 - $3.50 per day. Box 238, Nanuet, Rockland Co., N. Y.

BROOK BEND TAVERN
all year-round house
Monterey, Massachusetts
8 miles from Great Barrington
High in the Berkshire Hills Tavern recently renovated, decorated and beautifully furnished. Steam heat and electricity. Four huge open fireplaces. Delicious home food. Suites with bath. Rates by the day, $5 and up. By the week, from $28 to $60. Send for illustrated folder to
MISS LEILA LIVINGSTON MORSE

ARTHUR HOPKINS presents
'WHAT PRICE GLORY'
by Maxwell Anderson & Laurence Stallings
PLYMOUTH THEATRE
45th ST. W. of B'WAY
EVS. 8:30 - MATINEES THURS. & SAT. 2:30
'REAL and RINGING and FIERCELY GOOD-HUMORED' — Robert Littell, New Republic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED